

Second Maccabees and Jewish Society
Representations of
Jewishness, Hellenism and the Interaction
Between the Greeks and the Jews

A Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Canterbury

By

Gary Morrison

Classics Department
University of Canterbury

BS
1825,52
.M879
2004

Acknowledgements

There are so many people who have assisted me in the lengthy process of researching and writing this dissertation. Some roles have been obvious and direct, others more subtle and seemingly unrelated. However, the final result would have been impossible without their input, presence, guidance, support and friendship.

Specifically, I want to acknowledge the staff and my fellow Ph.D. students in the Classics Department at the University of Canterbury. You all have been willing to provide thoughtful advice and help whenever I sought assistance (or diversion!). In addition I would like to make special mention of and thank Dr. Katherine Adshead, who first encouraged me to consider postgraduate study and who has continued to support my efforts in her retirement. Also Prof. Tim Parkin, who was always supportive and available (both in NZ and the UK), and who arranged meetings for me with Prof. Erich Gruen in Berkeley and Prof. Fergus Millar in Oxford – both of whom, in turn, I also want to thank for making time to see me, for discussing my work, and providing thought provoking comments. Finally, I want to emphasise the support and encouragement of my supervisor, Dr. Victor Parker. His enthusiasm, insight, and willingness to discuss and question my work has been invaluable. I am extremely grateful for his input and time. Of course, if it needs to be said, any errors remain my responsibility.

I want also to acknowledge my family for believing that I could and would finish this project and thereby believing in me. Thank you also to my friends and all the members (past and present) of the Tuesday night basketball team: you all in different ways and at different times helped me maintain some sort of balance and made the journey far more enjoyable. Finally, but by no means least, I want to make special mention of Mary Himiona whose perseverance and understanding, support and encouragement helped make a difficult project possible: Ka nui te aroha ki a koe.

* * *

This dissertation was completed with the financial support of the 'Foundation for Research Science and Technology' through a 'Top Achiever Doctoral' Scholarship. I was also given some assistance through a William Georgetti Scholarship and a University of Canterbury 'Canterbury Scholarship'. International Conference attendance, research at other universities and site visits were made possible through the 'Foundation for Research Science and Technology' and a 'Claude McCarthy' award.

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Part One:	
Setting The Scene – From the ‘Other’ in Herodotus’ <i>Histories</i> to the Introduction of the Ἰουδαῖοι	
• Chapter One Some Issues Relating to Identity	24
• Chapter Two Self Identification: Toward a Definition of the Ἰουδαῖοι	43
Part Two:	
Jew and Gentile	
• Chapter Three ‘Us’ In Second Maccabees	59
• Chapter Four Ἕλληνες as the ‘Other’ in Second Maccabees	79
• Chapter Five The Other Nations and Second Maccabees	101
• Chapter Six The Use of ἔθνος in Second Maccabees	131

	Page
Part Three:	
From Perception to Reality	
Judaism and Hellenism in Second Maccabees	
• Chapter Seven	
What is in a Name?	153
• Chapter Eight	
Recognising Reality: The Existence of Hellenistic Judaism	183
Conclusion	213
Appendix One	
Ἰουδαῖοι In Second Maccabees	225
Appendix Two	
The Surrounding Nations	228
Appendix Three	
Second Maccabees: Character Identification and Description	235
Appendix Four	
Flowchart of Character's Ethnicity, Actions, and Names	242
Abbreviations	243
Bibliography	245

Abstract

In the Second Century B.C.E. the Jews rebelled against their Seleucid overlords achieving, for a while at least, some sort of limited independence. The events that occurred are, in the main, recorded by two works: First and Second Maccabees. The latter of these is a much neglected text. It is maligned as tragic or pathetic history and generally only used by scholars on an ad hoc basis to support particular arguments. Second Maccabees is, however, still a product of a particular time and place, and therefore can give insights into the society from which it evolved.

This thesis makes use of this premise to analyse Second Maccabees. Our intention is to uncover some of the author's perceptions and beliefs in order to explain aspects of Jewishness and Jewish society. To do this we approach the text in a fresh way, paying close attention to repeated uses of particular words and any patterns in context that can be associated with these words – this includes associations that are made to particular events or groups. Repeated patterns, it is suggested, provide both an insight into aspects of the author's society and a context within which to interpret the text.

As part of this process we also discuss: First, the concept of identity – Jew, Judaeans and the role of the 'other'. Second, the place of the Hellene and Hellenic culture in Jewish society (Jewishness), with particular attention given to the age old dichotomy of Jew versus Greek, Hellenism versus Judaism. The result suggests that the increasing tendency to minimise any Jewish–Hellenic conflict should be reassessed. This does not mean that Jews did not adopt aspects of Hellenic culture, but rather that the reality is far more complex. Societies operate and evolve on many, often (seemingly) contradictory levels, the self adoption of foreign (Hellenic) ideas does not mean that Hellenism cannot symbolise a threat.

Introduction

The Jewish texts First and Second Maccabees describe a nationalistic movement.¹ First Maccabees outlines how the Jewish people, led initially by Judas Maccabaeus, rebelled against the Seleucids establishing (eventually) the Hasmonaean dynasty; while Second Maccabees discusses the first fifteen years of the rebellion ending just before the death of Judas. In these books we have, therefore, important and rare historical accounts of events occurring in Second Century Judaea, and for that matter the wider Seleucid Empire. Yet only recently have the important historical insights – and from our perspective, ‘social insights’ – provided by these texts begun to be recognised.² The Maccabaeian Books have not so much been ignored as that analysis has been limited to discussions on the canonical status (or otherwise) of the so-called Apocryphal Books, or that the texts have been selectively used in general studies of Jewish History.³ Moreover,

¹ All dates are B.C.E. unless otherwise stated. All translations are my own, although I have used appropriate Loeb and Penguin volumes for Greek and Latin texts. For Biblical texts I have used *The Revised English Bible* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1989) and numerous Commentaries (see Bibliography, in particular note that for First and Second Maccabees Goldstein’s Commentaries and Abel’s Commentary were both used extensively). Therefore, what I have set often reflects agreement with these translations. Since the text of Second Maccabees is central to our discussion, references to the author of this work often are made by some term/phrase such as ‘our author’.

² This probably results from the discoveries at Qumran [see Vermes G. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls In English* (Penguin Books: London, New York, Auckland; 1998)]. While there were no fragments from either First or Second Maccabees, the interest and publicity the finds generated increased the recognition of the role the ‘Apocryphal’ Books can play in determining the history of Judaism (Jewish society) and Jewish thought in the period prior to the advent of Christianity [see Goldstein J. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 41A (Doubleday: New York, 1983) ix]. There are some excellent early investigations and discussions on both First and Second Maccabees. We emphasise the rapid growth of research in more recent times, especially within the broader subject area of “Jews in the Hellenistic World” where studies recognise the value of these texts.

³ The Apocrypha [from Apocryphon: literally ‘hidden writings’] – also referred to as ‘Deuterocanonical Books’ – are understood as a collection of Jewish writings composed between about 250 B.C.E. and 100 C.E. that the Catholics (and, with qualifications, Orthodox and Eastern Christians) accept as canonical but Protestants (with qualifications) and Jews now do not. They were preserved in the major Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible (but excluded from the rabbinical canon), and by Jerome who, with exceptions,

the lack of focussed analysis has resulted in a piecemeal approach to the texts; the clear preference for First Maccabees over Second Maccabees; and a reliance on the objective while neglecting the subjective when identifying facts and interpreting both books. Exactly what some of these comments mean will emerge shortly. Suffice it to recognise now that all relate in some way to methodology – by which I mean how and why a text is investigated, as well as the parameters historians establish when undertaking any research.

In addition two further issues are central to discussions concerning First and Second Maccabees. First, both these texts are regarded as an (if not ‘the’) important representation of an alleged conflict between Judaism and Hellenism / Greek and Jew.⁴ During the Nineteenth Century C.E. interpretations of this conflict tended to explain it in terms of a deliberate Hellenising policy of Antiochus IV’s.⁵ By the Twentieth Century

gathered them together at the end of his Latin translation (the Vulgate). Related are the Pseudepigraphical writings, a term often used to refer to (generally) non-canonical works ascribed to prophetic or patriarchal figures from Jewish (Biblical) history. See Schürer E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* Rev. Ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman. In Three Volumes (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1973-1987) III.177-180; Charlesworth J.H. [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (DoubleDay: Garden City, New York; 1985); Neusner J. and Green W.S. [Eds.] *Dictionary of Judaism in The Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E. In Two Volumes* (MacMillan Library Reference USA: New York, 1996) I.48, II.507.

⁴ Consider Erich Gruen’s opening sentence in his recent book *Heritage and Hellenism*: ‘The revolt of Judas Maccabaeus represents for most researchers the pivotal point in the confrontation of Judaism and Hellenism’ [Gruen E. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1998) 1]; or Jonathan Goldstein’s more general comment in his opening statements to an article on Jews and Hellenism, an article in which Judas Maccabaeus’ rebellion is central: ‘ “The Greek confronted the Hebrew. Judaism confronted Hellenism.” Thus runs the conventional wisdom of our time’ [Goldstein J. ‘Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism’. In E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson [eds.] *Jewish and Christian Self Definition* Vol. Two: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World (London, 1981) 64-87, 318-326].

⁵ See, for example, Schürer (1973-1987) I.147-8. Schürer, of course, wrote his account towards the end of the nineteenth century. While a deliberate policy of Hellenisation is doubtful, Schürer is supported by Tacitus [Tac. *Hist.* V.8].

C.E. scholars had begun to recognise that Judaism and the Jews were not closed to everything Hellenic and that a sort of 'Hellenistic Judaism' developed. This notwithstanding, some elements of Jewish society still clearly stood apart from Hellenism's influence and as a result an underlying conflict remained.

Two influential theories outline variations of this basic argument: that of Elias Bickerman⁶ (which Martin Hengel followed and subsequently developed further⁷); and

⁶ Bickerman spelt his name in three different ways (Bickerman, Bickermann, and Bikerman), but we will use one (Bickerman) throughout. Bickerman's Bibliography is extensive, but of particular importance are: Bickerman E. *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (Berlin, 1937), translated into English by H.R. Moehring as *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (Leiden, 1979); *Institutions des Séleucides* (Paris, 1938); *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, 1988).

Bickerman's thesis is that 'extreme Hellenists' existed in Jewish society (Menelaus and the Tobiads) and that they tried to reform Judaism. The idea was to remove the barriers, such as food taboos, purity regulations, circumcision, etc., that tended to isolate Jews from the surrounding world. The reformers (Hellenisers) believed that they were developing an enlightened Judaism. Bickerman, therefore, argues that Menelaus (not Antiochus) was an ideologue who was responsible for prompting the king into action, perhaps even promoting the religious suppression [Based on II Macc. XIII.3ff., but see also Josephus *Antiquities* XII.385]. As we might expect, the reformers' plans met resistance from more traditional elements within Jewish society. The result was the Maccabean rebellion. For more, including comments and assessments by other scholars see, in particular: Grabbe L.L. *Judaism From Cyrus to Hadrian* In Two Vols. (Minneapolis, 1992) I.148-153, 250ff provides a good summary of the arguments made by Bickerman and Hengel. Grabbe also provides references to criticisms of their respective studies, the most important of which include: Bringmann K. *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa* (Göttingen, 1983); Feldman L.H. 'Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* in Retrospect'. In *JBL* 96 (1977) 371-82; Millar F. 'The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism*'. In *JJS* 29 (1978) 1-21; Momigliano A. Review of *Judentum und Hellenismus*, by M. Hengel'. In *JTS* 21 (1970) 149-53; Tcherikover V.A. *Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1959) 183ff.

⁷ See Hengel M. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (Fortress Press: Philadelphia; 1974), *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period* (SCM Press: London; 1980).

Hengel demonstrates through an exhaustive examination of a wide variety of evidence that Palestinian Judaism is not a separate entity from Hellenistic Judaism [Cf. Hengel (1974) I.103-6]. The Jews of the second century did not hold themselves aloof from the world they lived in, rather they were as much a part of it as the other peoples of the Near East. In this way Hengel does question the idea that Judaism and Hellenism were incompatible concepts, or at least binary opposites. Yet Hengel accepts Bickerman's thesis as to the cause of the rebellion. Therefore, there is the inference of a cultural conflict, at least to some extent. See Goldstein [(1981) 65] who also seems to reach this conclusion. Note also the comments by Grabbe (1992) I.148-53 and the other references cited in n. 6 above.

that of Victor Tcherikover⁸. Most other modern theories simply derive from these scholars' works. Moreover, while these scholars' may disagree on particulars, there remains for us the fundamental recognition that 'Palestinean' Judaism was not immune from the world at large (i.e. Hellenism). All the same, on some level or in some sector of Jewish society a rejection of Greek influence remained. In this way the confrontation model or, as Tessa Rajak defines it, a 'polarity' between Judaism and Hellenism stands intact.⁹

⁸ Tcherikover's theory is presented in his Book *Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1959). In short, Tcherikover views the Jewish nationalistic movement (i.e. the rise of the Hasmonaean State) as a class struggle between the masses and the aristocracy (including the priests). The conflict is, therefore, viewed as political, with Hellenism and Judaism positioned as opposing forces. However, the desire to build a Hellenistic state on a Jewish national foundation proved to be impossible: 'Judaism and Hellenism were, as forces, each too peculiar to itself to be able to compromise within one country. A Hellenistic state could not be founded upon the Jerusalem theocracy' [(1959) 264-265].

Tcherikover does accept that over time Hellenism had a cultural impact on Jews, albeit as individuals. That is, Hellenism ceased to be a political tool through which it was possible for a Jewish faction to seek change; rather, it (Hellenism) only operated or was influential in the cultural sphere. This is how we can account for the considerable Greek traces that are present in Jewish literature, language, and law: 'Generations of proximity to the Greeks had not passed over the Jews of Palestine without leaving considerable traces in their literature, language, law and all other aspects of their civilisation' [(1959) 265]. In regard to the Maccabean revolt itself, Tcherikover suggests that the Upper Class Hellenistic movement in Jerusalem met resistance from the Hasidim. Antiochus IV reacted by sacking the city and by sending Apollonius to install a military colony. The subsequent handing out of land confiscated from city residents to the military colonists renewed tensions [Based on Daniel XI.39 and the Philosopher Porphyry's explanation of this passage in the Third Century C.E. See Bar-Kochva B. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1989) 438ff, esp. n. 8; Bickerman (1937) 85-6; Hengel (1974) 512-15; Montgomery J.M. *The Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh, 1927) 463 – non vidi; Tcherikover (1959) 189-90]. Furthermore, Tcherikover suggests that these soldiers were Syrian and that as citizens of Jerusalem they began to worship their gods in the Temple [Contra: see Bar-Kochva (1989) 92-105, and esp. 438-44; Grabbe (1992) I. 251-2]. This desecration resulted in further Jewish outcry and unrest. Antiochus, realising that religion was the basis for Jewish resistance, imposed his persecutions. In other words, Tcherikover views Antiochus' attack on Jewish religion as a response to the revolt, not the cause of the revolt. Regardless, the Jewish-Greek dichotomy is present.

⁹ Rajak T. 'The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism'. In P.R. Davies and R.T. White [Eds.] *A Tribute to Geza Vermes* (England, 1990) 261-80; for the above comment see Pp. 261.

Such assertions have not convinced all scholars. In recent times some have suggested that the Judaism–Hellenism distinction has received overemphasise. To some extent we saw the start of this possibility in Hengel’s work, although Erich Gruen most recently and far more directly has argued this point. Gruen suggests that First and Second Maccabees contain little to support the idea that Judas Maccabaeus rebelled against ‘Hellenisers’ or ‘Hellenism’. In short, Gruen surmises that Judaism and Hellenism were not incompatible concepts.¹⁰ While there may be some truth in Gruen’s latter observation the ‘cultural conflict’ dimension of the texts has yet to be adequately explained. To that end, regardless of whether one accepts or rejects the possibility of a Hellenic-Jewish conflict, the dichotomy itself remains central to any analysis of First and/or Second Maccabees.¹¹

The second issue that we must introduce is that of identity. It is only recently that understanding Jewish identity (in the Hellenistic period) has begun to receive extensive attention, albeit primarily through a debate centered on defining the term Ἰουδαῖοι. Perhaps the most notable or, at least, extensive recent work in this area is Shaye Cohen’s

¹⁰ Gruen E. (1998) *passim* esp. 1-40. Gruen is not alone in this interpretation of First and Second Maccabees, see also Goldstein (1981) 64-87, 318-326. Note also Hengel (1974) ‘From about the middle of the third century B.C. *all* Judaism must really be designated “Hellenistic Judaism” in the strict sense’ [104]; although as we have discussed, Hengel also recognises that the process of Hellenisation was not uniform in its ‘acceptance by’ and ‘effect on’ the Jewish population. In other words, ‘Palestinian’ Judaism was a part of the wider Hellenistic world and not immune from the influences of that world, yet this did not prevent important sectors of society from interpreting Hellenism as detrimental to Judaism. There is some maintenance of a belief in cultural confrontation.

¹¹ In no way should these statements be taken as an arbitrary dismissal of Gruen’s thesis: it is detailed and has gained much support [See, e.g. the comments in the following reviews: H.W. Attridge *JR* Vol. 80 No 1 (2000) 163-4; P.W. van der Horst *JBL* Vol. 118 No 4 (1999) 129-31; J.E. Seaver *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* Vol. 30 No. 3 (1999) 493-4; also the recent book by Johnson S.R. *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 2004)]. Our study may differ in interpretation in some areas, but the primary points that we will be trying to demonstrate have more to do with: (1) how we reach our results, i.e. methodology; and (2) how the adoption of Hellenic practices does not mean that ‘Hellenism’ can’t still be perceived as a threat.

book *The Beginning of Jewishness*, in which he argues that the definition of Jewishness evolved from an ethnic to a religious basis.¹²

“The development of *Ioudaios* from Judaeen to Jew testifies to a momentous development in the history of Judaism, the growth of the non ethnic conception of Jewishness. Such a conception is not securely attested until the Second Century B.C.E., when the Hasmonaeans, under the influence of Greek political ideas, extended citizenship in the Judaeen state to the Idumaeans and Ituraeans”.¹³

Furthermore, Cohen also suggests that the evolution in meaning of Ἰουδαῖοι is first attested in Second Maccabees and that Jewishness in itself presumes a contrast between ‘us and them’ (Jew and Gentile).¹⁴ These are ideas that are central to our study. Initially, in Chapter One, we investigate the concept of the other in ancient texts by looking at some of the work that has been done in relation to Herodotus’ *Histories*. This discussion will present a better understanding of how the term Hellene was evolving. In Chapter Two we explore the complex and diverse meanings of the term Ἰουδαῖοι, and in doing so we will refine some of the issues addressed by Cohen. Later Chapters also explore and discuss issues that are associated with identity, albeit in relation to how the Ἰουδαῖοι (Chapter Three), the Ἕλληνες (Chapter Four), and/or ‘the other’ (Chapters Three to Eight), are represented in Second Maccabees – the text upon which we will focus our analysis.

¹² Cohen S.J.D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* Hellenistic Culture and Society 31 (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1999). This book has received positive reviews. See, e.g. Sivan H. ‘What Has Jerusalem To Do With Rome (Or Athens, For That Matter?)’ *Judaism, Classics, and Ancient History*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (1999.07.21).

¹³ Cohen (1999) 342.

¹⁴ Cohen (1999) *passim*; but for some specific examples see Pp. 92-93 for the first usage of Ἰουδαῖοι in the sense of ‘Jews’ [II Macc. VI.6 and IX.7]. For a summary of Jews defined by an ‘other’ and the concept of a boundary between Jew and Gentile see Cohen (1999) 341ff.

We have now introduced the Hellenes twice: once in terms of conflict (or otherwise) with the Jews, and again in relation to Jewish identity. The multiple number of roles for any one term or concept within a study demonstrates that events and subjects in our past (or just societies) are complex. Rigid compartmentalisation in any analysis is artificial. Events do not stop and end at arbitrary boundaries be they chronological, ideological or subject related. Certainly limitations are needed for clarity, but we must recognise that the drive for simplicity can distort reality.¹⁵ The role(s) of the Hellenes in relation to the Jews (or at least a faction of Jewish society) demonstrates this fact. We should not try to distort the interrelated and contradictory events that are the reality for the actors at the centre of our study, but rather account for such complexities by stressing context and by trying to incorporate a more holistic approach when interpreting the evidence. This will result in speculative judgements. However, we also gain a far richer understanding of issues our author was either trying to impart or were integral to his society (at least as they were perceived by him).

In order to do this we will discuss terms and concepts within the context of a text – Second Maccabees – and some predetermined definitions. Three terms in particular need mentioning: Hellenism, Judaism and ethnicity. The former two are central to this thesis and are largely defined in the first two Chapters.¹⁶ Be that as it may, it is perhaps necessary to add a few parameters to the term ‘Hellenism’¹⁷, in that we will understand it

¹⁵ Consider how Tcherikover attempts to categorise Hellenism as only influential in the cultural sphere and not the political [(1959) 264-5; see also n. 8 above and Grabbe (1992) I.154]. Surely political factors are both a part and a product of the culture and society in which they are formed?

¹⁶ Furthermore, Chapters Three and Four analyse the use of these terms in Second Maccabees.

¹⁷ The available literature on ‘Hellenism’ is vast and this is not the place for an extensive Bibliography. Some principle works which can be used as a starting point include: Droysen J.G. *Geschichte der Diadochen* (Gotha, 1836) and *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (Gotha, 1877). On Droysen and Hellenism see Bravo B. *Philologie, histoire, philosophie, de l’histoire: Étude sur J.G. Droysen, historien de l’antiquité* (Wroclaw, Warsaw, and Krakow; 1968) esp. 338-349. See also Green P. *Alexander to Actium: The*

to mean: 'the diffusion of Greek culture amongst the variety of peoples of the Mediterranean'. We will impose a geographic limitation of the Near East and chronological boundaries of Alexander's conquests to the consolidation of the 'Roman Empire' under Augustus. Our focus is the spread of Hellenic ideas and their adoption by various peoples, although it must be stressed that we are in no way trying to imply any policy of deliberate integration. Rather, the spread of Hellenic culture should be understood as something which proceeded ad hoc, and be associated with the administrative requirements and power wielded by the ruling Greek classes. This notwithstanding, we should also recognise that local peoples were able to absorb Greek culture without losing local traditions¹⁸, and that cultural influence was not all one way.¹⁹ This suggests that no 'pure strain' of Greek culture, whatever that might mean in principle, existed in the Near East. 'Hellenism', therefore, is best understood as an umbrella term under which the Greek component varied amongst the different peoples of the Mediterranean.²⁰ There is however a constant: the Seleucid regime. This dynasty,

Hellenistic Age (London, 1990) 312ff; Momigliano A. 'Hellenism'. In *EJ* VIII (1972) col. 291 and in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Middletown, 1977) 307-312; Goldstein (1981) 64; Rajak (1990) 262ff. Judaism is, of course, just as complex a topic as Hellenism. We have not included any introductory parameters for Judaism at this point, however, as defining Ἰουδαῖοι is a central part of our later discussions.

¹⁸ Millar F. 'The Problems of Hellenistic Syria'. In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White [eds.] *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilisations From Syria to Central Asia After Alexander* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 1987) 110-133, esp. 132: 'Yet as regards towns, or urban centres, there is enough evidence to suggest that it was possible to absorb Greek culture without losing local identity; and that Hierapolitans, Phoenicians and Samaritans when abroad positively emphasised their non-Greek identity'.

¹⁹ Consider, for example, the archaeological evidence from Ai Khanum. This was a Greek πόλις in the Far East, yet its buildings clearly suggest a 'mixed' – Greek and Achmaemenid – architectural style. See Colledge M. 'Greek and Non-Greek Interaction in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East'. In A. Kuhrt et al. (1987) 134-162, see esp. 142. Note also Green (1990) 332.

²⁰ Gruen's Greek 'ingredients' or 'conspicuous presence rather than a monopoly' [(1998) xiv]. See also Millar (1987) 132; Rajak (1990) 264-5.

while containing eastern elements, is defined as Hellenic: It has a clear Hellenic heritage, Hellenic components ('ingredients'), and is perceived by those in the East as Hellenic.²¹

The second term that requires some comment at this point is 'ethnicity'. In the past ethnicity has been understood as a concept almost interchangeable with race, with perhaps a cultural element providing some form of distinction.²² More recent studies, however, have tended to introduce more complex ideologies that have influenced how we

²¹ To reinforce this point consider also the introductory comments by the author of First Maccabees where he makes it perfectly clear that the Seleucid dynasty is Greek: Alexander is described as the King of Greece [I Macc. I.1], he marched out from *Kittim* [Greece] and defeated Darius (see Goldstein J.A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 41 (New York, 1976) 191-2, and comments below). Furthermore, Alexander's successors ruled his provinces: 'And descended from them was that impious man Antiochus Epiphanes, son of King Antiochus' Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῶν ῥιζα ἁμαρτωλὸς Ἀντίοχος Ἐπιφανής, υἱὸς Ἀντίοχου τοῦ βασιλέως [I Macc. I.10]. References to Alexander as a Macedonian we should also interpret to mean as a Greek – from the perception of an outsider (i.e. Jew) in the Second Century B.C.E.

We should also note that *Yawan*, the usual Hebrew word for Greece, had come to refer to the Seleucid Empire by this time, cf. Daniel VIII.21, X.20; Goldstein (1976) 191-192; Torrey C.C. 'Yawan and Hellas as Designations of the Seleucid Empire'. In *JAOS* 25 (1904) 302-11. *Kittim* had been a word generally associated with the distant west, cf. Jeremiah II.10, but owing (in part) to the designation of *Yawan* for the Seleucid Empire *Kittim* came to be used by the author of First Maccabees as a term for the 'Greeks'. This notwithstanding some ambiguity remained (and hence our 'Greek ingredients' phrase), and the author of First Maccabees does on occasion distinguish between the Seleucid Empire – as 'Asia', Hellenic Greece – as *Yawan*, and Macedonia – as *Kittim*; cf. Goldstein (1976) 192. Later, *Kittim* could also refer to Rome: see (e.g.) Josephus *Antiquities* I.6.1 (128).

²² Consider, e.g. Gilbert: 'Some older theorists [For example, Rex J. *Race and Ethnicity* (Milton Keynes, Open UP, 1986) Chapter Two] distinguish ethnicity from race simply on the grounds that ethnicity involves cultural rather than physical differentiation' [Gilbert P. *Peoples, Cultures and Nations In Political Philosophy* (Washington, 2000).]. Jones asserts that in the 'nineteenth- and earlier twentieth century conceptions of ethnicity ... [were] ... not far removed from the concept of race [Jones S. 'Identities In Practice: Towards An Archaeological Perspective On Jewish Identity In Antiquity' In Jones S. and Pearce S. [Eds.] *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period* Journal for the Study of the Psuedepigrapha Supplement Series Vol. 31 (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1998) 29-49 esp. 32 n. 8 (for quote)]. Other terms for 'ethnicity' have included: 'nationality', 'nationalism' and 'minority'. See Ronen D. 'Ethnicity, Politics, and Development: An Introduction'. In D.L. Thompson and D. Ronen [Eds.]. *Ethnicity, Politics, and Development* (Lynne Rienner: Boulder, 1986) 1-10; esp. 1, 3ff – note that Ronen also goes on to discuss the distinctions between nationalism and ethnicity. See also comments by Enloe C.H. *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development* (Boston, 1973) 3.

will be using the term.²³ Let us be a little more specific. Ethnicity incorporates the idea of group membership, which is based on criteria recognisable both by those in the group and by those who are outside it. It is important to appreciate that one of these factors does not have to be common, biological descent. There just has to be a *belief* in shared ancestry.²⁴ This idea manifests itself in our extant sources through the manipulation of kinship: a shared ancestry is developed when it is needed or in order to help 'define' a people.²⁵

Other factors that ethnicity may incorporate are a shared culture (in terms of e.g. religion, customs, and language); shared historical memories (be they real or imagined); and a link with a geographic area (homeland), which does not have to be physical and could conceivably even be no more than a shared imagined memory.²⁶ This latter point must be stressed, since our discussion of identity issues in Chapters One and Two (especially) emphasises a lessened role for geography and a focus on cultural matters/customs by both the Jews and the Greeks in the identification criteria that each

²³ Some reading to introduce modern discussions on Ethnicity include: Banks M. *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions* (Routledge: London and New York; 1996); Barth F. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Boston, 1969); Bentley G.C. 'Ethnicity and Practice' In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 29 (1987) 24-55 (with extensive bibliography and summary of how discussion on ethnicity has evolved from the 1950's); Hutchinson J. and Smith M. [Eds.] *Ethnicity* (Oxford, 1996); Ronen D. (1986) 1-10. See studies mentioned in n. 27 (above) as well. In relation to the ancient Greek world see Hall J.M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997); Hall J.M. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago and London; 2002).

²⁴ See Weber M. 'The Origin of Ethnic Groups'. In J. Hutchinson et al. (1996) 35-40, note also some comments in the 'Introduction' to Hutchinson et al. Pp. 3-14 esp. 4-7; Cohen R. 'Ethnicity: Problem and Focus In Anthropology' In *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 7 (1978) 379-403, esp. 385 where Cohen suggests that 'Max Weber defined it a *sense* of common descent going beyond kinship, political solidarity vis-à-vis other groups...' (emphasis added). Contra, see some points raised by Gilbert (2000) 21. On racial categorisation by those outside the group itself see e.g. Gilbert (2000) 9-21.

²⁵ Consider Herodotus' manipulation of the Medes' ancestry [Hdt. VII.62]. Also consider, the alleged kinship between the Jews and the Spartans [I Macc. XII.1-23], although in Chapter Five we present an alternative interpretation of this relationship based on its representation in Second Maccabees.

²⁶ Some of these same points are also made by Hutchinson et al. (1996) 6ff.

group employs.²⁷ At any rate, at this stage we should simply recognise that these different factors indicate a form of group solidarity. Moreover, they demonstrate that an ethnic group is identifiable on a subjective level: The imagined can be the reality. In order to clarify this concept we again use the ‘other’ and define identity in relation to the Greeks (versus Barbarians) and Jews (versus Gentiles) respectively. For now, perhaps all we have to observe is that the whole ideology behind an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ (i.e. ‘other’) understanding of peoples (identity) helps emphasise that ethnicity, and indeed identity itself, is to some extent a social construction.

In outlining these parameters we are not trying to present the final definition as to what ethnicity is or is not. Rather, the comments we have made are there to present an indication of issues and concepts that have and are being developed in the social sciences. This, in turn, provides a form of foundation to the ideas that we will raise and discuss in relation to our area of interest. To that end, we have not defined the term ‘ethnicity’, instead we presented a concept with broad parameters or boundaries. This should enable an understanding of both what is intended when we discuss ‘identity criteria’, and an indication of the ideology behind our methods.

Second Maccabees

Our study will thus analyse, discuss and define the Jews, Hellenes, the Gentiles, their respective relationships and Jewish society (Jewishness) as the text of Second Maccabees represents them. We need, therefore, to make some preliminary comments about the book. In the format in which it has been transmitted to us there are two prefixed

²⁷ Although it has not been made clear in our discussions to date there is also a political element that is associated with culture and customs. This comes out, in part, in our identity discussions in (especially) Chapters One, Two, and Eight of this thesis. We should also stress that the idea of shared imagined history/memories is clearly central to the formation of a Jewish group. We recognise this through our emphasis on traditions (law) and religion.

letters [II Macc. I.1-10a; I.10b-II.18], with the text proper beginning in the middle of Chapter Two. At this point is a 'Preface' [II Macc. II.19-32] where our author outlines how he intends to provide an accessible summary of Jason of Cyrene's complex and detailed five-book history of Judas Maccabaeus' activities and the purification of the Temple. While some have dismissed Jason as an authorial invention to give the alleged epitome credibility we need not, I think, be so sceptical. After all, we would expect our author to use an authoritative (i.e. Biblical) name for this purpose: Jason is otherwise unknown.²⁸ Moreover, our study will demonstrate that any invented author would have been most unlikely to have a Greek name. We should accept therefore that Second Maccabees is what it purports to be, a summary. This does not mean that our author was just a copyist: there is little doubt that he was in control of his material.²⁹

Be that as it may and despite our author's noble intentions his efforts are often derided. The dramatic narrative has led to the book being classified as 'tragic or pathetic history' – a label used by historians since Polybius who want to question a work's

²⁸ On the dismissal of Jason as a fiction see Kamphausen A. 'Das zweite Maccabäerbuch'. In E. Kautzsch von [ed.] *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Georg Olms Verlag, 1992) 81ff. The most prominent example of an author roughly contemporary to ours using a Biblical name for credibility would be the Book of Daniel; Daniel is mentioned along with Noah and Job in Ezekiel 14.14, 20; and described as very wise Ezekiel 28.3 [see LaCocque A. *Daniel in His Time* (South Carolina, 1988) esp. 3-8; Eissfeldt O. *The Old Testament: An Introduction Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the works of similar type from Qumran. The History of the Formation of the Old Testament*. Translated by P. R. Ackroyd (Oxford, 1966) 512-29, 767-69; Schürer (1986) III 245-50]. For more on this discussion and some arguments for and against the existence of Jason (with references) see Doran R. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose And Character of Second Maccabees*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly: Monograph Series Vol. 12 (Washington, 1981) 81-84. Doran agrees with our assessment that there is no reason not to accept the existence of a larger work by Jason. For more on Jason more generally see, especially, Schürer (1973) I.19-20 and references cited therein.

²⁹ We should also note here that the debate over whether or not this is a complete summary of Jason's work (i.e. whether or not our author ended his narrative before Jason) will not affect our discussion. For completeness, however, our author does indicate that it is a full summary [II Macc. II.23] and I see no reason to doubt him here. Consider also Momigliano's comments [(1975a) 82].

historical accuracy or worth.³⁰ Certainly there is some support for such scepticism since the narrative does open with the first attested miracle of the Second Temple [II Macc. III.24ff]. Still the inclusion of stories and dramatic descriptions is a recognisable part of both Greek historiography and Jewish (Biblical) tradition.³¹ Furthermore, we must not dismiss supernatural intervention as a Jewish phenomenon. Greek historical writings also contain 'miraculous' descriptions: Herodotus, for example, describes how, at the battle of Salamis the Greeks might have been unsuccessful had it not been for the 'intervention' of a phantom figure.³² The simple truth is that the 'stories' can help us understand the society which either creates or transmits them. They are in a sense windows into a people's beliefs and ideas, which when analysed in their correct context will provide valuable insights.³³ Therefore, in itself a 'dramatic' narrative should not degrade the value of an historical text for it can still demonstrate (at the very least) an author's outlook.

³⁰ Polybius II.56.8-14 where the work of Phylarchus is attacked. However, note that Polybius himself uses emotion and tragedy: cf. XV.24-33; XVI.30-34; XXIII.10-11. The modern description of Second Maccabees in these terms really began with Niese, who ironically was trying to show that it was trustworthy [Niese B. 'Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung'. In *Hermes* 35 (1900) 268-307, 453-527 (= *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher*. Berlin: Weidman, 1900)]. Since then Bickerman [(1937) 147]; Abel [F.M. Abel *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Études Bibliques (Paris: Gabalda 1949)]; and Habicht [Habicht 2. *Makkabäerbuch* Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Band 1, Lfg. 3; (Gütersloh: G Mohn 1976) 189] have all maintained the categorisation of Second Maccabees as "tragic", to the detriment of its acceptance as a "proper" historical work [Contra, note Doran (1981) 77-81]. For more discussion on tragic history see Doran R. '2 Maccabees and Tragic History'. In *Hebrew Union College Annual* Vol. 50 (1979) 107-14; Doran R. (1981) 84-97; Goldstein (1983) 20ff; Momigliano A. 'Greek Historiography'. In *History and Theory* 17 (1978) 1-28, esp. 8; Walbank F.W. 'History and Tragedy'. In *Historia* 9 (1960) 216-234: where Walbank states he would like to discard the term as a figment and a distortion (233-234); Walbank F.W. *Polybius* (University of California: Berkeley; 1972a) 38. Note also Schürer (1986) III. 533.

³¹ Consider the stories in Herodotus, such as the account of Gyges' usurpation of Candaules' throne [Hdt. I.8-12], or those in the Pentateuch, such as Moses being hidden amongst the reeds in the Nile and saved by the Pharaoh's daughter [Exodus II.1ff].

³² Hdt. VIII.84; also VIII.94 when divine intervention brought the fleeing Corinthians back to the battle.

³³ Note Doran (1979) 110: 'One must attempt to assess the work of 2 Maccabees in itself, and attempt to grasp how the author is proceeding'; and later: 'one should attempt (a) to isolate structures in the work

It is also curious that while scholars are quick to use the abridger's stated desire 'to provide entertainment' [II Macc. II.25] in order to undermine Second Maccabees, they remain silent on his stronger assertions that he will focus on 'the main points' [II Macc. II.28]; aim at 'conciseness of expression' [II Macc. II.31]; and how the summary will be 'an aid for students who must commit the facts to memory' [II Macc. II.24].³⁴ The reality is that in the Preface our author does not imply that the work is inferior, only more accessible – not a bad 'fault' for an historical work to possess!

Allegations of inferiority also imply a comparison and there can be no doubt that Second Maccabees has suffered due to a preference for First Maccabees. To some extent the reasoning is rational and obvious: First Maccabees does present as a more matter of fact historical narrative. Yet this is an interpretation based largely on presentation, which I think may have provided a false sense of authority. First Maccabees does have its problems. The author was very much biased towards the Hasmonaean dynasts, to such an extent that it is generally accepted as the Hasmonaean (Maccabaeen) or 'official' version of events.³⁵ Furthermore, the author also develops characters, such as Mattathias, as biblical heroes – their actions are compared to epic struggles or representations in the

which connect it with contemporaneous works, and (b) to determine features of propaganda or apologetic which have led the author to organise his material around certain emphases' [114].

³⁴ See Momigliano (1975a) 81-88 who implies that the abridger's work is a lesser piece of scholarship than Jason's: 'He [the abridger] explains with care the difference between an epitome and a *real* historical book as the difference between a work of entertainment and edification and a work of research and erudition' [Pp. 81, emphasis added]. Schürer suggests that in places the abridger's compression was incompetent [(1986) III. 533]. In a recent survey of Jewish historical works Second Maccabees is confined to a footnote: Sterling G.E. *Historiography and Self Definition* (Brill: Leiden, New York; 1992) 141 esp. n. 19.

³⁵ Consider Schürer: 'as early as 1857 A. Greiger noted: "The author of the First Book of the Maccabees is the state historian of the Maccabaeen dynasty." (*Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 206)' [(1973) III.1 180 n. 1]. See also Goldstein (1976) 4-26, 72-78; (1981) 81; (1983) 4; Grabbe (1992) I.223.

Bible.³⁶ Finally, events may not always be presented in succession, rather at times there could be a thematic approach: Chapter Five has been considered a compilation of campaigns that took place over several years, yet the framing events (the Purification of the Temple [I Macc. IV.36ff] and Antiochus IV's death [I Macc. VI.1-17]) both date to December 164 B.C.E.³⁷ This means that First Maccabees is part of a particular literary genre that has its own rules and expectations: historical accuracy may not be as important as the author's agenda. Aligned to this observation is the simple fact that Second Maccabees is also far more detailed concerning events in the first Fifteen years of the rebellion and can be demonstrably more reliable than First Maccabees. As demonstrative, consider how First Maccabees only records one invasion of Egypt by Antiochus. Second Maccabees correctly has him invading twice and is more detailed concerning events in Judaea at this time (which are the events that led to the persecution and rebellion itself).³⁸

One factor that is often used to promote First Maccabees is its (relative) date of composition, it is usually considered the earlier of the Maccabaeen texts. Recently an elaborate theory has even been constructed advocating that Second Maccabees was written in response to First Maccabees. While the comparative dates of these texts will not affect our discussions, we should perhaps note that all opinions and theories are modern reconstruction's, nothing in our earliest references provide us with a relative

³⁶ See comments and references in Goldstein (1976) 6-8, 21ff; (1983) 31ff. Note Goldstein also discusses the differences between Biblical Histories and First Maccabees (1976) 12ff. Some specialised studies demonstrating that First Maccabees includes literarily reconstructed Chapters include: Williams D.S. 'Narrative Art in First Maccabees' *Vetus Testamentum* 49 (1999); Mölleken W. 'Geschichtsklitterung im I. Makkabäerbuch (Wan wurd's Alkimus Hoherpriester?)'. In *ZAW* 65 (1953) 205-28.

³⁷ See (e.g.) Niese (1900) 471; Abel F.M. 'Topographie des campagnes machabéennes'. In *Revue Biblique* 32 (1923) 495-521 esp. 512.

³⁸ Compare II Macc. V-VII with I Macc.16-63. See Grabbe (1992) 282-3; Bickerman (1979) 10, 45-6.

chronology.³⁹ This notwithstanding, if I may venture an unsubstantiated opinion, the way that First Maccabees seems to develop topics raised by Second Maccabees – in particular the alleged Jewish-Spartan kinship and the discussion on nudity (and circumcision) in the gymnasium – may suggest that the traditional ordering needs to be reconsidered.⁴⁰

As for absolute dates there are a variety of opinions expressed, none of which are definitive. All we can really determine is that both texts must have been written before Pompey captured Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E: the Romans are not presented as enemies and our author understands that Jerusalem had been in possession of the Hebrews since Nicanor's defeat [II Macc. XV.37]. Popular consensus seems to date First Maccabees to after the reign of John Hyrcanus [134-104 B.C.E.], as the author refers to the chronicles of his reign [I Macc. XV.23-24]. Second Maccabees is more difficult. The date of the first letter [II Macc. I.1-9] is 124 B.C.E, if we accept that the text proper was attached to this letter when it was written then we have the *terminus ante quem* for the book (which could provide some further support for our suggested relative chronology). Unfortunately we can not certain that our assumption is correct, the text could have been attached to the letter at anytime. Nevertheless, I suspect Second Maccabees was composed before 124 B.C.E. summarising a work that was written shortly after the rebellion itself.⁴¹

³⁹ The first reference to the 'Maccabaeae Histories' is made by Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* I.21.123; V.14.97; See Abel (1949) viii-x; Goldstein (1976) 3-4; Schürer (1986) III. 534-35. Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* VIII.9.38 and Jerome *Prologus Galeatus* to the Books of Samuel contain the earliest designation to 'The Second Book of the Maccabees'.

⁴⁰ These points are discussed in more detail in this thesis (see especially Chapter Eight), but only as a secondary issue as the relative order is not our primary concern and in reality probably remains impossible to reconstruct.

⁴¹ On possible dates of the books see Goldstein who suggests that First Maccabees was written by 90 B.C.E.; Jason of Cyrene wrote his work by 86 B.C.E.; and our author wrote his abridgement between 78-63 B.C.E [(1976) 72-89; (1983) 71-83]; Momigliano (1975) 103-105 who dates First (and Second) Maccabees to during the reign of John Hyrcanus (i.e. before 104). Bar-Kochva (1989) 162-64 also dates the book to the reign of John Hyrcanus, most likely to before 125 and suggests that the author was an eye-witness to several of the battles he describes. Grabbe (1992) I.223, follows Bar-Kochva. Finally see discussions by

Despite our advocacy of Second Maccabees we would be amiss in not recognising that it too has its problems and biases. Consider, for example, its strong theological purpose. The Lord, the laws and the Temple are consistently emphasised throughout – from the mighty apparition that prevented Heliodorus from plundering the Temple’s treasury through to God’s epiphanic help in the last battle of the narrative.⁴² This recognition raises two issues: First, it suggests that religion will be an important factor in our discussions of identity, a point that we will frequently address. Second, such a strong theological focus provides another contrast with First Maccabees where the narrative is far less overtly theological.⁴³ There are also factual errors or (perhaps more precisely) factual manipulations in Second Maccabees – such as the chronological issues relating to Lysias’ campaigns and the problems in dating and ordering the letters in Chapter Eleven. Second Maccabees is not without its problems, and it must be read with care taking particular note of context.

Schürer (1973) 19-20 (on Jason), (1986) III. 181, 531-2; note in particular comments by Abel (1949) xlii-xliii; Eissfeldt (1966) 579-581; Hengel (1974) I.96ff; Rajak (1990) who suggests Second Maccabees is a summary ‘composed before 124 B.C.E. of a history written close in time to the Maccabean crisis itself’ [262]; and Collins J.J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York, 1982) 76ff.

⁴² II Macc. III. 8ff and XV.27 respectively. See Goldstein (1983) 21ff, with a list of references to the religious doctrines and scriptural allusions in the book at n. 60; note also Schürer (1986) III.533. Principal themes in the book include: God’s relationship to the Jews, the Holiness of the Temple at Jerusalem, the value of martyrdom, the doctrine of resurrection, and the position of the Hasmonaean family, see Goldstein (1983) 12. Momigliano adds mixed attitudes to foreigners and Tribal versus warrior spirit [(1975a) 85]. In addition, the importance of following all aspects of the law and defending Judaism are points discussed at various places in this thesis.

⁴³ This is not meant to suggest that there is no religious component or element in First Maccabees, rather that the emphasis is different – consider the respective attitudes towards observing the Sabbath: compare I Macc. II.29-41 with II Macc. VIII.26, XII.38, XV.1ff (note that one of Antiochus IV’s persecutions was to forbid Jews to keep the Sabbath [VI.6]). We discuss the Sabbath again in Chapter Eight, this thesis. For further discussion on the relationship between First and Second Maccabees see Goldstein (1976) 3-36; (1983) 3ff; Grabbe (1992) 222-225; Schürer (1973) I.17-18.

These later points also raise some important issues on the composition and transmission of the text that require some comment. To that end, let us begin with the language in which our text was written – as Jerome noted long ago the literary style strongly suggests that our author wrote in Greek.⁴⁴ By way of confirmation, there can be no doubt that our author was aware of some of the subtleties of the Greek language. He was, for example, able to manipulate concepts (i.e. ‘Hellenism’, ‘Judaism’) and use irony extensively: our author was demonstrably in control of both his material and the Greek language.⁴⁵ There is nothing complex or controversial about this observation.

Our second point, however, is more problematic. As we have indicated there are two letters prefixed to the start of the book proper. Neither were written by our author (they are not integrated into the main text and contain some discrepancies with it), so why and when they were attached is the subject of much debate.⁴⁶ The first letter is dated 124 B.C.E., it is from the Jews in Jerusalem encouraging the Jews in Egypt to celebrate the rededication of the Temple. There seems no reason to doubt its authenticity and there is

⁴⁴ Jerome *Prologus Galeatus* Vol. XXVIII cols. 593-604: ‘Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi; secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest: the First Book of Maccabees is found in Hebrew, the Second is a Greek [Book] which can be shown from the style [phrases] alone’; see Goldstein (1976) 16 and n. 24. Schürer attributes the rhetorical Greek style to the abridger [(1986) III .532].

⁴⁵ If it needs to be stated this does not mean that our author was Greek, the subject matter and biases (perceptions) inherent in the text strongly indicate that he was Jewish. Composition in Greek also provides for another comparison with First Maccabees, which was written in Hebrew; see Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV. 25.1-2; Jerome *Prologus Galeatus* Vol. XXVIII cols. 593-604 (see n. 44 above); Goldstein (1976) 14-16; Grimm C.L.W. *Zweites Buch der Maccabäer*. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes (Leipzig, 1857) 6-7; Richnow W. *Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Stil des zweiten Makkabäerbuches* (Diss. Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen: unpublished; 1966).

⁴⁶ See Schürer who notes the above points and summarises the opinions of Bickerman, Eissfeldt, and Momigliano [(1986) III. 533]; also Goldstein (1983) 6, 25-27.

little to indicate much in the way of further editing.⁴⁷ The second letter is more dubious. While it also encourages the Jews in Egypt to celebrate the rededication of the Temple, it is inauthentic (allegedly coming from Judas Maccabaeus himself, yet probably is a First Century B.C.E. forgery), contains a probable interpolation [II Macc. I.18b-II.15], and has a very different account of Antiochus IV's death [II Macc. I.13-16] from that of the main text itself [II Macc. IX.4-29].⁴⁸

These problems have, not surprisingly, caused extensive debate, most of which remains superficial to our discussion. Our focus is the main text of Second Maccabees, which can be considered a separate document and studied independently of the prefixed letters. After all, it (the text) and the attached letters were written by different authors so variations in patterning (understand 'beliefs') are not only understandable, but to some extent they are expected. Be that as it may, as near contemporary (and combined) documents the letters can be (and often are) included in our analysis if only to provide a wider social perspective or for interest. Furthermore, the process of adding these letters to the text and the possible existence of interpolations (in at least the second letter) raises the prospect of a third hand editing aspects of the main text itself. Different explanations have been advanced, most notably that they were combined either in the First Century B.C.E. as a Festival work or in 124 B.C.E. to encourage Alexandrian Jews to remain within the fold of the Jerusalem Temple. Yet, as the editors to Schürer's work observe, 'neither hypothesis is entirely satisfactory'.⁴⁹ The simple reality is that we do not know

⁴⁷ Doran (1981) 3-5; Schürer (1986) III.533; Bickerman E.J. 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr.' In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History II* (Leiden, 1980) 136-58.

⁴⁸ By way of introduction to several of the issues raised (and for further references) see Bickerman (1980) 136-7; Doran (1981) 6-12; Goldstein (1983) 164-66, 540-545; Gruen E. 'The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple'. In *Scripta Classica Israelica* 16 (1997) 47-70; Schürer (1986) III.533-4.

⁴⁹ Schürer (1986) III.534.

when or why the letters and text were combined, nor the extent of any subsequent modifications. Therefore, it is better, on this occasion at least, to work with what we do know and can assess instead of developing theories that will inevitably raise further questions and problems.

To that end, let us establish some guidelines for our analysis. Certainly we can acknowledge that Second Maccabees was edited to some extent, however we can also reasonably assume that this editing did not result in any significant amendments to the main text itself. This means that the main text as we have it is primarily the product of the summariser of Jason's work (identified as 'our author'). The complexity of the text as a whole and the subtle concepts used by our author throughout in themselves go some way to demonstrating this viewpoint. Furthermore, even though the exact date of Second Maccabees eludes us we can accept that it provides a good indication of social conditions in the mid to late Second Century. In addition, while each letter (and the main text) are independent documents they are at least closely contemporary, thereby suggesting that each is a construct of similar social conditions. This (and the fact that they were all combined at some stage) also means that there are some common links between all these documents. Although this is not of primary interest to us, a common underlying theme that we do make comment on is the concern expressed as to how Judaism can best survive in the expanding Diaspora.

Finally, we must mention the various extant manuscripts of Second Maccabees, all of which are extensively discussed and summarised by Goldstein in Chapter Seven of his *Commentary on Second Maccabees*.⁵⁰ The edition of the Septuagint that we have

⁵⁰ Goldstein (1983) 124-128. There are extensive references in Goldstein's short Chapter, but note in addition those cited by Schürer (1986) III. 535; and on the Septuagint more broadly Jellicoe S. *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1968). See also some earlier comments by Goldstein in his *Commentary on First Maccabees* [(1976) 175ff].

used is that compiled by Rahlfs, which is based primarily on *Codex Vaticanus*. For the text of First and Second Maccabees, which is not in *Codex Vaticanus*, Rahlfs has used *Codex Sinaiticus* and *Codex Alexandrinus*.⁵¹ When we have had to depart from Rahlfs' edition of the text or when there are significant alternative readings between manuscripts we have commented in the notes. For all word searches (see Chapters Three, Four, Six, Seven and appropriate Appendices) we have used the University of California's CD Rom: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.⁵²

*

*

*

We have spent considerable time introducing Second Maccabees and the various concepts that we will be discussing. It is also our intention to demonstrate another way of analysing the text. To that end, even at the risk of repeating some points, let us be more specific. The idea of limiting any analysis of a particular text because it does not fit modern concepts of what history is, and/or selectively reading a text to support particular opinions is not the best use of our corpus of extant evidence. The simple reality is that every text is the product of a time and place and can give insights into the society in which it arose. In practice this means that we will play close attention to repeated uses of

⁵¹ The various extant versions of the Septuagint and explanations of the each Codex are introduced briefly by Goldstein (1983) 124-6, they are also explained in the Introductory comments to Rahlfs' edition on the Septuagint [Septuaginta Ed. by A. Rahlfs (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart; 1979)]; or, for more detail, see (as a starting point) Jellicoe (1968) 176-266. Rahlfs' work, with regard the text of First and Second Maccabees, was completed by Werner Kappler [*Maccabaeorum liber I*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis, Vol. IX, fasc. I (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936)] and Robert Hanhart [*Maccabaeorum liber II*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis, Vol. IX, fasc. II (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959)] respectively; see Jellicoe (1968) 18ff.

⁵² We should also recognise the existence of two other texts that bear the Maccabaeian name: Third and Fourth Maccabees. Neither of these texts is particularly relevant to our study. Third Maccabees is set in the reign of Ptolemy IV (221-204 B.C.E. and was (probably) written in Augustan times [See Grabbe (1992) I.177 for a brief summary and references; Johnson (2004) for a recent study]. Fourth Maccabees is probably a First Century C.E. creation and is a philosophical discussion of the stories of the martyrs that we find in Second Maccabees [II Macc. VI-VII] see Neusner et. al. (1996) II.398-9; Schürer (1986) III.588-93.

particular words, any patterns that may be identifiable each time the same word is used (in terms of context not phrases), and whether there are particular associations (to events or groups) that our author makes when using certain words. Repeated patterns, it is assumed, will suggest biases and underlying beliefs. Silences and/or assumptions made, by our author, on factors that our audience should know are equally important and operate in the same sort of way. In short, they all provide windows into another level of society, and interpretation of all such elements relies heavily on context.

As perceptions and beliefs are generally not directly expressed by an author, this entire process requires us to undertake varying degrees of speculation. We are, after all, dealing with elements of the subconscious which, although they are certainly present in the text, are notoriously difficult to identify. This is not intended to suggest that we will introduce extravagant assumptions, based on little if any evidence; but we will extrapolate from what is presented (or omitted) to suggest possible interpretations. In much the same way, this methodology will also mean that we are going to be faced with contradictions. On occasion there will be differences between what is expressed directly in the text and underlying elements. So in Chapter Eight we will address how 'Hellenism' can be condemned while Judaism is clearly evolving and becoming 'Hellenised'.

While we recognise that our results cannot, reasonably, be put forward as representative of all Jewish society, we can and do suggest that they provide an indication as to the beliefs of a significant faction of that society.⁵³ This is done on the basis that the text was circulated – shown in part by the fact that it is extant – which in itself indicates an affinity with its contents, ideologies and arguments by many of those who chose to keep it. We also cannot ignore the simple fact that Second Maccabees is but one of several texts that takes up the defence of Judaism during the Second Century (most

⁵³ The size of the Jewish faction that our author could be representing is explored in Chapter Eight.

clearly demonstrated by First Maccabees), thereby indicating a wider readership for the sorts of concepts advocated by our author.⁵⁴

These difficulties should not prevent us from developing a methodology that takes better account of our author's subjectivity. The simple reality is that societies are complex entities and to impose neat categories upon them is artificial. In order to advance our understanding of how people lived and interacted in the ancient world, we must embrace the abstract and accept that contradictions are a reality of daily life.⁵⁵ Of course I am not suggesting that we do not apply any boundaries or parameters to our study – some structure is needed so that we can make our discussions coherent and meaningful. Rather, what we do need to realise is that the parameters we do impose are our constructs, and therefore they must restrict to some extent our understanding of ancient societies. The point is that by recognising these premises we can broaden our approach and be more accepting of contradictory information, which ultimately adds to our knowledge. In some ways these interpretations are more real, taking us beyond the artificial 'either – or' and recognising more fully the multidimensional, complex realities of everyday life.

Finally, the issues that we introduce and the interpretations that we make are in no way intended to be the definitive answer as to the relations between the Greeks and the Jews in the Second Century B.C.E.; the complete definition of 'Ιουδαῖοι and 'Ελληνες; and/or the final interpretation of Second Maccabees. Certainly, we will present opinions on all these points, but what is more important is the way that we address these issues.

⁵⁴ Other examples include the Book of Daniel (especially 7-12); The writings of Ben Sira; The Book of Jubilees; etc. See by way of introduction Grabbe (1992) I.175ff, 225ff, 234ff; but note that none of these texts have undergone an analysis similar to that which we will undertake on Second Maccabees.

⁵⁵ Analysis of the 'subjective' in addition to the 'objective' is stressed by Tessa Rajak as a way forward in analysing the relationship between Greeks and Jews: see Rajak T. *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Brill: Leiden, Boston, Köln; 2001) 6.

Part One
**Setting the Scene – From the ‘Other’ in Herodotus’ *Histories*
to the Introduction of the Ἰουδαῖοι**

* * *

Chapter One
Some Issues Relating To Identity

‘The centrality of the idea of the land of Israel for many Jews today and throughout history is unquestionable ...’¹

Jewish identity and the land of Israel – or Judaea – are doubtlessly interrelated. Consider, for example, the divine promises in the Pentateuch, the homesickness of the exiled Psalmist by the waters of Babylon [Psalm 137], and the existence at various times of a Jewish state in the region (albeit with varying degrees of autonomy)². While the modern political situation in the Middle East can explain the significance of this relationship, at least in part, we should not unduly minimise our understanding of the land-people relationship: The Jews and Judaea have an undeniable connection. Be that as it may, there is more to being a ‘people’ than a geographic location. The question, therefore, should be the degree of association or the extent to which a land defines one’s identity.

To that end it is interesting to observe that the geographic significance of Judaea to Jewish identity is strongly linked and almost always discussed as a religious concept.³

¹ Pearce S. and Jones S. ‘Introduction: Jewish Local Identities and Patriotism in the Graeco-Roman Period’. In S. Jones and S. Pearce [Eds.] *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Sheffield, 1998) 13-28 (13).

² The current nation of Israel is the most recent manifestation; in the period that we will be the Hasmonaeans establish some degree of autonomy.

³ See Pearce and Jones (1998) 14.

Only relatively recently has extensive research been carried out into the role of territory (Judaea) and its relationship in antiquity with Jewish society, politics, culture, as well as religion.⁴ Furthermore, scholars have no doubt tended to discuss and analyse 'Jewishness' in a religious context. To a large extent this can be attributed to the nature of our evidence. So much so that even in our later analysis of Ἰουδαῖοι and Second Maccabees religion will be a very important component, it will not however *be* Jewishness. Concepts such as ethnicity and culture will also enter the debate.⁵

Recent research has also resulted in an evolution in the understanding of Judaism, Jewish daily life, and Jewish identity in the Graeco-Roman period.⁶ Old normative,

⁴ Examples of Studies on the territorial dimension in Judaism include: Davies W.D. *The Territorial Dimension of Judaism* (Berkeley, 1982); Hoffman L. [Ed.] *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives* (Notre Dame, 1986). Some studies have focussed specifically on Jerusalem, see: Poorthuis M. and Safrai C. [Eds.] *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (Kampen, 1996). Some of the essays in Poorthuis et al. also explore the social, political and/or cultural concepts and their relationship to territory for Jewish communities. See also: Mendels D. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land* (Tübingen, 1987); Gafni I. *Land, Centre and Diaspora: Jewish Perceptions of National Dispersion and Land Centrality in Late Antiquity* (Sheffield, 1997). Further references are also in Pearce and Jones (1998) 14-15, esp. n. 6 and n. 7.

⁵ Kraabel, for example, observes that the discussion on Jewish identity is traditionally based on or in religious terms: See Kraabel A.T. 'The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions' In *JJS* 33.1-2 (1982) 445-64 (454-5). For some (Jewish) religion and 'Jewishness' seem almost to be synonymous. See for example Jones on how it is only recently that scholarship has begun to question 'whether Jewish identity at this time was primarily of a religious or ethnic character' [(1998) 31]. Kraabel also questions the traditional religion-based analysis of Jewish identity [(1982) 445-64]. To a large extent the direct association between religion and Jew is due to the modern English definition of Jew. Consider Cohen's summary: '... in contemporary speech the English word *Jew* has a range of meanings different from that of its ancient forerunners. English *Jew* is primarily a "religious" term: a Jew is someone who believes in (or is supposed to believe in) and practices (or is supposed to practice) Judaism, as opposed to a Catholic, Lutheran, Episcopalian, Hindu, Muslim, and so forth' [(1999) 69].

⁶ See, for example, Barclay J. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan* (323 BCE – 117 CE) (University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1996) 4-9; Jones S. 'Identities In Practice: Towards An Archaeological Perspective On Jewish Identity In Antiquity' In Jones S. and Pearce S. [Eds.] *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period* Journal For the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series Vol. 31 (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1998) 29-49 (29); Kraabel (1982) 445-64; Overman J. 'The Diaspora in the Modern Study of Ancient Judaism'. In

homogenous models of Jewish life and Judaism in Judaea and in the Diaspora are giving way to a recognition that Jewish communities and Judaism itself were multifaceted, interrelated and complex subjects.⁷ We now recognise that different forms of 'Judaism' existed in different places in the Diaspora and even among different groups of Jews in Palestine.⁸ All embracing terms therefore – such as Jews, Judaism (and Hellenism) – in reality only refer to segments of the societies they purport to represent or their respective 'defining criteria' can differ depending on various external factors (such as chronology, local community influence, geographic location, etc.). Without doubt the crucial issue in defining and discussing such concepts is context, a term which incorporates the principles of understanding our evidence and identifying our author's perceptions and the part of society that he represents.

If nothing else this discussion demonstrates that the analysis of any group's identity is a difficult prospect. Some clarification is available from the fields of

Overman J. and MacLennan R. [Eds.] *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel* (Atlanta, 1992) 63-78.

⁷ The literature on this subject is growing rapidly. See as a starting point: Smith M. 'Palestinian Judaism In The First Century'. In Davies M. [Ed.] *Israel: Its Role In Civilisation* (New York, 1956) 67-81; Barclay (1996) *passim*; Collins J. *Between Athens And Jerusalem: Jewish Identity In The Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York, 1986); Overman (1992) 63-78; Tcherikover V. 'Prolegomena'. In Tcherikover V. and Fuks A. [Eds.] *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (Jerusalem, Cambridge (MA); 1957) I 1-112. Pearce and Jones discuss this topic with further references (1998) 14 ff esp. 15 n. 9.

⁸ A danger has been that the study of Judaism or the Jews is segregated into those in the Diaspora and those in Judaea; see, for example, Goodman M. 'Jews and Judaism in the Mediterranean Diaspora in the Late Roman Period: The Limitations of Evidence'. In *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* Vol. IV No. 2 (1994) 208-224. This is little more than a simplistic construct, Jews and Judaism should be examined in whatever context they arise. Certainly artificial categorisation is necessary at times to provide limits and therefore comprehension, but we must recognise that this can prevent a true representation from being uncovered. The lifestyle and culture of the Jews differed everywhere, dependent on their circumstances and the nature (daily realities) of the local communities within which they resided. See Seager A.R. and Kraabel A.T. 'The Impact of the Discovery of the Sardis Synagogue' In Hanfmann G. [Ed.] *Sardis From Prehistoric to Roman Times: Results from the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958-1975* (Cambridge MA, Harvard; 1983) 168-190 (178); Overman (1992) 63; Jones (1998) 38 and references cited therein.

anthropology and sociology, where scholars have recognised that identity is best understood in terms of geography, common descent and ethnicity (which is viewed as a culturally based identity). It follows, therefore, that a group is identified by concepts such as language, history, social practices, geography, blood lines, culture, politics *and* religion; as well as how each (concept) relates, changes, is ignored, and/or adapted by that group.⁹ This later point is important: none of the criteria are fixed. Therefore, the significance of Judaea to the Jews could be redefined by circumstances and even bloodlines can be (and were) manipulated: Genealogies still play a role in identity but were adapted as circumstances required.¹⁰

Analysis of these concepts (and a group's identity) is best done through a discussion of the boundaries between groups. These boundaries are normally constructed both from within the group and from without through the segregation of the world's peoples into two distinct groupings: 'us' and 'them'.¹¹ This sort of classification is not

⁹ The association between ethnicity and common descent was particularly strong in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries where 'ethnicity' and 'race' were virtually interchangeable terms. Modern anthropological and sociological literature define ethnicity more in terms of culture. See. E.g. Jones (1998) 32 esp. n. 8. The semantics of a precise definition of ethnicity (or even identity itself) need not concern us, rather we need only to recognise that all these concepts played a part and that each was fluid (adaptable).

¹⁰ The Greeks did this regularly. Herodotus, for example, invents a common ancestor for the Medes – Medea [Hdt. VII.62]; or Perses as ancestor to the Persians [Hdt. VII.61]. See also comments in How and Wells which indicate that this etymological association is both far older than Herodotus and can still be found in later works [(1928) 152]. Another example is a Decree of Xanthos (206/5 B.C.E.), which was made in response to an embassy from Cytenion. It appears that the people of Cytenion had sought financial help from the Xanthians and in order to support their application provided elaborate details of a fictitious kinship: see SEG XXXVIII (1988) 1476.

¹¹ See Cohen (1999) 5ff, 341; Duszak A. [Ed.] *Us and Others: Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures* (John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Philadelphia; 2002) – where the title of her collection of papers says volumes "Us And Others"; Friese H. [Ed.] *Identities: Time, Difference And Boundaries* (Berghahn Books: New York, Oxford; 2002) esp. Introduction, but the individual papers are also informative; Jones (1998) 37ff. Finally consider the collection of papers in Silberstein L.J. and Cohn R.L. [Eds.] *The Other in Jewish Thought and History: Constructions of Jewish Culture and Identity* (New York University Press: New York, London; 1994) which also demonstrates how elements of the other can exist within a society (e.g. women can be constructed as the other by a patriarchal society).

unusual. Clear proponents include the ancient Greeks who labelled all non-Hellenes as 'Barbarians'.¹² The initial distinction seems to have emerged on the basis of language, simple onomatopoeia: *barbaros* was a description of the incomprehensible sounds of a non-Greek's speech.¹³ Over time the concept of the 'Barbarian' developed – primarily in relation to the Greeks' conflict with the Persians – so that by the Fifth Century B.C.E. a barbarian had become everything a Greek was not, the 'other' of Hellenic (especially Athenian) culture.¹⁴

This ideology was not unique to the Greeks. The ancient Chinese, for example, described 'non-Chinese' in terms that denoted a foreigner's 'simplicity' or 'naturalness' (*chih*) in opposition to the Chinese culture.¹⁵ The ancient Egyptians categorised all

¹² The bibliography on the Hellene-Barbarian antithesis is very extensive with relevant 'modern' scholarship beginning in the eighteenth and nineteenth century; i.e. Steinhof J.U. *Dissertatio critica de voce barbaros* (Tübingen, 1732) [non vidi]; or Roth F. *Bemerkungen über den Sinn und Gebrauch des Wortes Barbar* (diss. Nuremberg, 1814) [non vidi]. A good list of major references on this topic (including the above authors) is provided by Long T. *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Southern Illinois University Press, 1986) 188 n. 1. See also Cartledge P. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, 1993). Hall E. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989) *passim*; Hall (2002) esp. 172-228; Harrison T. [Ed.] *Greeks And Barbarians* (Edinburgh, 2002). Lloyd G.E.R. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought* (Cambridge, 1966).

¹³ Thucydides [I.6.1-6] implies that initially there was no difference between the customs of the early Greeks and foreigners – a comment supported by Plato [*Republic* V.452c-d] and Aristotle [*Politics* 2.5.II.1268b 38-40]. Such comparisons in themselves indicate how advanced and 'civilised' the Greeks had become in relation to foreigners. At any rate, that a distinction did develop between Greek and non-Greek based on speech (initially at least) is beyond doubt. The earliest use of 'barbaros' is in Homer, see *Il.* II.867, note Kirk G.S. *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume I: Books 1-4* (Cambridge, 1985) 260. Strabo [XIV.2.28 (662)] also discusses this reference making the connection between 'barbaros' and incomprehensible sounds. See also Crawford M. and Whitehead D. [Eds.] *Archaic And Classical Greece: A Selection Of Ancient Sources In Translation* (Cambridge, 1983) 30 (1); Hall (1989) 4; Long (1986) 130.

¹⁴ See Hall E. (1989) 60ff; Hall J. (2002) 172-228.

¹⁵ See Hall (1989) 4, 60ff and references cited therein. The period of interest in Chinese history is after the overthrow of the Chou dynasty, the advent of the northern threat and the establishment of a centralised network controlling the previously independent, warring Chinese states (i.e. from 221 B.C.E.). This led to a clear distinction being made between the Chinese and those outside the confederacy (a geographic area marked by the great wall). Subsequent dynasties implicitly recognised the distinction between themselves

foreign lands (regardless of the ethnicity of the inhabitants) as 'hsj' or, if we are to believe Herodotus, all foreigners as 'barbarians'.¹⁶ The Jews, for their part, tended to call foreigners 'goyyim' (conventionally translated as 'gentiles'). Therefore, our definitions and descriptions of 'Jewishness' or 'Greekness' presumes a contrast between 'us' and 'them'.

This division of the known world is reasonably self explanatory and relatively easy to comprehend. What is more complex is the process by which groups make these categorisations. Modern commentators have come to realise that identity is a subjective concept, a product of the imagination.¹⁷ This does not mean that the boundaries are not real: that both groups accept the existence of the boundary and the criteria for its identification demonstrates the reality. However, as a product of the mind boundaries are not always distinct: they can be blurred or changed as circumstances require. As a result contradictions can and do exist. Philo, Josephus and the Rabbis acknowledge, for example, that group boundaries can be based on culture and/or shared descent. The fact

(Chinese) and the others (non-Chinese) in the administrative systems they set up [again, see Hall (1989) 60-61]. In addition also consider a very recent study by Minglang Zhou who demonstrates that the Chinese use of the verbs *lai* (come) and *qu* (go) in modern society may help define social spaces and in themselves draw 'Us and Them' distinctions. See Zhou M. 'Between Us and Them in Chinese: Use of Lai (Come) and Qu (Go) in the Construction of Social Identities'. In Duszak A. [Ed.] *Us and Others: Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures* (John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Philadelphia; 2002) 51 – 67. These points notwithstanding, also note Lattimore O. 'Nowhere, not even in the most ancient of references, is there any indication that the Chinese had a generic term for non-Chinese equivalent to the Greek *barbaroi*' [*Inner Asian Frontiers of China* Second Edition (New York, 1951) 455].

¹⁶ On the Egyptian classification of all foreign lands as 'hsj' see Hall (1989) 4 (esp. n. 4), 60. The passage from Herodotus is at II.158. While it is true that Herodotus' labelling is probably a Hellenised variation of what he experienced or heard, this in no way detracts from the accuracy of the underlying tradition: i.e. that Egyptians categorised other lands (if not peoples) as different, 'other'.

¹⁷ See Cohen who cites sociologist B. Anderson in defining a nation as 'an imagined political community' [(1999) 5]; Jones (1998) *passim*, but esp. 42ff; Rajak observes: 'Ethnic boundaries [are] attitudinal ...' [(2001) 5].

that these concepts could be irreconcilable does not seem to concern them.¹⁸ Furthermore, the subjectiveness of the boundary suggests that the criteria can be based on abstract concepts such as culture or beliefs that cannot necessarily be measured in any empirical way.¹⁹ This does not mean that we cannot identify aspects of a group's culture or identity that mark the difference between groups. Rather, it suggests that we need to look beyond traditional ideas and examine the possible perceptions of the participants – we need to move from the objective to the subjective.

Of course, with regard to ancient texts this introduces a whole new range of variables. In order for our analysis to progress we have to accept that it is possible to uncover our author's beliefs, opinions, attitudes, and perceptions that are both directly stated in the text or are evident as reasons behind the presented actions. Any results must be speculative, but this does not mean that we should not make the attempt. We must remember that our author did not write *in vacuo*. The world he lived in and understood influenced the way he chose to represent events and stories – just as society today provides part of the framework for our own work, guiding how we reconstruct history: consider (to mention just one thing) the influence of the women's movement on modern historiography. To some extent this is the ideology underlying Hartog's in-depth analysis of Herodotus' *Histories*.²⁰ Hartog demonstrates that in explaining the actions of others,

¹⁸ For more see Cohen (1999) 343.

¹⁹ Or, as we shall see as our discussion develops, subjective concepts enable us to utilise empirical data in different ways.

²⁰ Hartog F. *The Mirror of Herodotus: Representations of the Other in the writing of History* Translated by J. Lloyd (Berkeley, London, Los Angeles, 1988). See also Cartledge P. 'Herodotus and "The Other": A Meditation on Empire' In *Echos du Monde Classique / Classical Views* XXXIV, N.S. 9 (1990) 27 – 40; Redfield J. 'Herodotus The Tourist' In *CP* 80 (1985) 97-118; Marincola J. *Greek Historians* Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics No. 31 (Oxford, 2001) 19-60. The 'other' can also be analysed in specific categories such as 'Women': see Dewald C. 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories*' In Foley H. [Ed.] *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York, 1981) 91-125; Gray V.J 'Herodotus and the

Herodotus is holding a metaphorical mirror up to his audience – what ‘they’ do is the opposite to what the Greeks do. Consider the description of Persian customs [Hdt. I.131-140]. What the Persians do – eat little solid food, but abundance of dessert, kiss each other on the lips in greeting – the Greeks do not; while what the Persians do not do – fashion images of gods, offer burnt sacrifices on altars – is a normal part of Greek life.²¹ In the passages on Egyptian customs Herodotus goes even further specifically stating that Egyptian customs are the opposite to ‘normal’ and comparing them to the customs of ‘the rest of the world / mankind’ [Hdt. II.35]. In reality Herodotus’ comparative is with Hellenic customs as it is the Greek world that defines the relative position from which his observations are made.²² Herodotus admits as much when he specifies that the *Greeks* calculate by moving their hands from left to right, the Egyptians from right to left.²³

Cultural differences are not only defined as opposites. Herodotus also describes other people by illustrating aspects of their way of life that a Greek would find odd: he highlights the strange and unusual. In doing so his observations are based on his own society’s norms so every ethnographic description will in some way define Herodotus’ culture. The more ethnocentric these observations are the better they describe and define the culture from which they arise.²⁴ We can conclude, therefore, that it is through cultural

Rhetoric of “Otherness” *AJPh* 116 (1985) 185-211; Rossalini M. and Saïd S. ‘Usages des femmes et autres nomoi chez les ‘sauvages’ d’Herodote: essai de lecture structurale’ *ASNP* 8 (1978) 949-1005.

²¹ Paul Cartledge (1990) 35-36 has a good discussion on this passage.

²² Implicit in the Commentary notes on the chapters from II.35 onward. See How W.W. and Wells J. *A Commentary on Herodotus With Introduction and Appendixes* In Two Vols. (Oxford, 1912; reprinted with corrections 1928) I.179ff; Lloyd A.B. *Herodotus Book II Commentary* 1-98 (Leiden, 1976) 146ff.

²³ Hdt. II.36. See Lateiner D. *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, 1989) 148; Lloyd (1976) 148.

²⁴ The assumption is that an individual viewing another culture will do so from within a framework based on the culture from which s/he has come and that a displaced individual will try and identify aspects of his/her own culture in the new. See Redfield (1985) 90-91; Levi-Strauss C. *The Scope of Anthropology* Translated by S.O. Paul and R.A. Paul (London, 1967) 44ff. Note Lateiner’s comments in his study on

differences that we can both identify boundaries and learn about the group that produces them. Hartog's analysis gives us a demonstrable example of how to reconstruct a society's perceptions and its identity (in cultural terms).²⁵

A natural extension to this discussion is to relate the identity concepts that we have introduced to the ambiguity of some Greek words (labels), in particular *Hellenes* [Ἕλληνες] and *Ioudaioi* [Ἰουδαῖοι]. Upon reflection the parallel should be immediately apparent. Defining these labels and determining the identity of the group they indicate are essentially the same thing: in the analysis of both we use the same concepts or criteria. The debate over whether to translate Ἰουδαῖοι as 'Jew' or 'Judaean', for example, is nothing more than trying to ascertain what characteristics our author had in mind when he used the term and then using the correct modern label that best incorporates those criteria.²⁶ Recognising this relationship means that by defining the labels used by an author we can gain an insight into the appropriate group's identity and our author's perceptions. Be that as it may, we must also understand something of the broader context of such terms, such as how their meaning(s) may have been evolving, so that we can better analyse their use (role) in Second Maccabees.

Herodotus' ethnographies: 'even the relativist cultural anthropologist or historian can define otherness only from the stand point of his own education and culture'[(1989) 145].

²⁵ See Hall (1989) ix: 'This book is confined to the examination of one ancient people's view of others, but it has been written in the conviction that ethnic stereotypes, ancient and modern, though revealing almost nothing about the groups they are intending to define say a great deal about the community which produces them. The title might therefore almost as well have been *Inventing the Hellene* as *Inventing the Barbarian*'. Be that as it may we must caution against reading the *Histories* solely in terms of the 'other' – it becomes all too easy to make the entire work fit the 'other' framework. The identification of criteria that are cultural opposites to one's own does not necessarily discredit the observations: Egyptian men, for example, did weave (although the women probably did as well). See Lloyd (1976) 148. If there is one criticism that we could make with regard to Hartog's illuminating study is that it does perhaps go too far, although it is accepted that this may have been done to emphasise his point and to promote discussion of the concept – in which case we can say without reservation that he has succeeded.

²⁶ Note comments by Cohen (1999) 342.

The Hellene

Trying to define the term ‘Hellene’ and discussing the related topics of ethnicity and nationhood (or lack thereof) would require several volumes of analysis in itself. Clearly that is beyond the scope of this thesis, yet some comment must be made with specific regard as to how the Greek societal perception of the Hellene evolved. To do this let us continue with Herodotus who demonstrably segregated the world into Hellenes and Barbarians, defining the former against the later. This suggests that: First, from the perspective of our extant authors (e.g. Herodotus), a common Hellenic identity existed in some way or on some level from at least the Fifth Century B.C.E. onward. Second, the basis of that identity or, more specifically, the broad criteria by which identity is recognised, will be integral to the text.

These observations are broad, but fortunately we can be more specific. In Book Eight of the *Histories* Herodotus provides us with the four elements that he believes link the Hellenes together. The context is a speech to the Spartan ambassadors by the Athenians explaining why they (the Athenians) had rejected a Persian proposal for an alliance. This speech does include a sense of duty to the Greeks (perhaps ‘Greek nation’?)²⁷, but it is also – and at the very least – a definition of a people in terms of four components: common blood, language, gods, and way of life. Consider the relevant passage:

... αὐτίς δὲ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὼν ὁμαιμόν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματά τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἥθεά τε ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότας γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐχ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι·

... and then there is our common ‘Greekness’ in blood and speech, our common shrines for the gods and way of sacrifice, and our common habits in life [i.e. common way of life]. Athenians would not be able to betray these things.

[Hdt. VIII.144]

²⁷ I do not mean to suggest that Herodotus does see the Hellenes as a ‘nation’, rather to draw attention to the topic, see n. 30 below.

This passage introduces several points of interest. First, that these four categories while used here to define the Hellenes are in fact how a Greek – in this case Herodotus – describes a people. This is made clear by the ethnographic descriptions in the *Histories*. One or more of these categories become the criteria for describing the people of the world.²⁸ The inclusion/exclusion ad hoc of the categories may indicate that they are all not necessary for defining a people, or perhaps more accurately and relevantly, understanding who someone is cannot be made based on general assumptions of one or two categories (such as bloodlines or geography) alone.

Second, and by extension to our first observation, the above passage and the ethnographies suggest that the Greeks were grappling with new ways to define or describe not only the peoples that they encountered around the world, but themselves as well. No longer was the old geographic description of a people enough. In fact, in this passage *where* someone was born (i.e. geographic considerations) is no longer a factor.²⁹ This observation is best understood in the context that the Greeks were spreading further and further afield and thereby interacting with more and more different people. New ways were required to identify and explain who they were – so the ‘idea’ or description of a Hellene began to be based more and more on these four categories recorded (and used) by Herodotus.

In other words, what we are seeing is the shift in focus of defining a people from one based on geography to a more complex understanding loosely based around ‘culture’

²⁸ See How and Wells (1928) Vol. II 286. The suggestion that the order indicates relative importance is unfounded. I would place more value on a hierarchy of importance being assigned to the criteria used most often (a study which I do not believe has been completed and one that I hope to undertake in the future) – that is if a hierarchy can be assigned to these categories at all.

²⁹ Or, perhaps more correctly, is no longer a *stated* factor. It is interesting that at the start of each ethnographic description Herodotus takes care to describe where this ‘people’ or tribe lived. This certainly suggests that geography still has a role to play, but perhaps not as prominent a one as in the past – especially in relation to the ‘new’ criteria.

and perhaps even politics – if we take a loose definition of a people's 'way of life'.³⁰ This in no way is intended to suggest the start of a linear progression from a 'geographically' based identity to a cultural one. Consider our observation that 'culture' played a role in identity from the earliest times: Barbarians (and therefore Hellenes) were defined on the basis of their language!³¹ Rather, the point is that the criteria that best define a people change over time dependent on context and circumstances. Herodotus' *Histories* is just one indicator of this transformation, another is Isocrates:

‘... καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὄνομα πεποίηκε μηκέτι τοῦ γένους ἀλλὰ τῆς διανοίας δοκεῖν εἶναι, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἑλλήνας καλεῖσθαι τοὺς τῆς παιδείας τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ τοὺς τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως μετέχοντας.’

‘... and the name of Hellenes seems to be no longer one of a race but of a mindset and those who share our culture are called Hellenes more than those that share a common ancestry’.³²

³⁰ As has been noted and discussed by several scholars, Herodotus does not include a specific political category amongst the four cited above. It is this lack of any apparent political unity that is the basis for the suggestion that the Greeks cannot be deemed a 'nation'. This is true to an extent. However, care must be taken with such an argument as it is based on modern conceptions of what nationhood is: i.e. political unity is a fundamental requirement of any modern 'nation'. There is no compelling reason why this ideology should be transplanted back in time. After all, Greeks tended to belong to a variety of different groups – family, village, 'polis', military, 'ethnos' – we could see politics or 'political association' as another. The relevance for us is that in such a context any political association on behalf of an Hellene could be deemed a normal part of daily life. Therefore Herodotus perhaps understood politics in the category that he labels 'way of life'. For a discussion on the idea of Greeks and 'Nationhood' see: Finley M.I. *The Use and Abuse of History* (Chatto and Windus: London, 1975) especially Chapter Seven 'The Ancient Greeks and their Nation' Pp. 120 – 133, 233 – 236. Walbank F.W. 'The Problem of Greek Nationality' *Phoenix* Vol. V (1951) 41-60; Walbank F.W. 'Nationality as a Factor in Roman History'. In *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* Vol. 76 (1972) 145-68 – Walbank also discusses the problems associated with defining 'nation' [(1972) 146ff]; Rostovtzeff M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. In Three Vols. (Oxford, 1941) 502-3, 1347, 1439-1440; Ziolkowski J.E. 'National and Other Contrasts in the Funeral Orations'. In H.A. Khan [Ed.] *The Birth Of European Identity; The Europe Asia Contrast In Greek Thought 490-322 B.C.* (University of Nottingham, 1994) 1-35.

³¹ The importance of language to Greek identity can not be overemphasised, see Hall (1989) 4-5. Consider also the attitude inherent in literature such as Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1050-52 where the boundary between Greek and foreigner is again made on language.

³² Isocrates *Panegyricus* 50. The use of διάνοια in this passage is interesting. I have translated it here as 'mindset' trying to incorporate both the mental construction of identity (i.e. that it is a thought or notion,

Whether we should interpret Isocrates' statement as saying that through education 'non-Greeks' or Barbarians could become Greeks, or, as narrowing the concept of 'Greekness' to 'intellectual excellence' and a praising of Athenian culture as the pinnacle of Hellenism, does not affect our argument.³³ The passage recognises a link between being Greek or 'Greekness' and culture, regardless of how we interpret that association. Therefore Isocrates (and Herodotus) recognise the importance of culture in defining a people's identity and use 'cultural criteria' in constructing the boundary between what is and is not Greek.³⁴ Moreover, Isocrates' use of a comparative (μᾶλλον) may suggest a ranking in the listed criteria. The implication could be that at this time culture is regarded as more important than blood in defining a person's identity. Furthermore, if we accept that 'culture' includes Herodotus' common language, gods and way of life [Hdt. VIII.144], then Isocrates is giving us an account that to some extent minimises one of Herodotus' categories (common blood) in relation to the other three. In many ways this is

and perhaps even including the idea that identity is imagined, thereby mirroring the opinion of anthropologists and sociologists which we discussed earlier); and that identity is a process reliant on the mind. In this context we could perhaps even very loosely translate διάνοια as 'way of life'. Note that Isocrates made these comments *before* Alexander departed for Asia.

³³ See Usher S [Ed. and Translator] *Greek Orators Vol. III: Isocrates Panegyricus and To Nicocles* (Aris and Phillips Ltd: England, 1990) 161. Walbank (1951) 45-6.

³⁴ See also Isocrates *Evagoras* 66 where Isocrates alleges that King Evagoras transformed people of Barbarian birth into Hellenes. Of course as part of a rhetorical eulogy this passage contains much embellishment and might easily be dismissed on this basis [Cf. Brunt P.A. 'The Aims of Alexander' *G&R* Second Series Vol. 12 No. 2 (1965) 203-215; who comments on Isocrates' writing style (albeit with regard to the Panhellenic crusade): 'The Panhellenic Crusade was a fiction for everyone but modern scholars who suppose that Isocrates' writings were admired for anything but their languid eloquence' (205)]. Such criticisms notwithstanding, *Evagoras* 66 could also suggest that such a transformation from Barbarian to Hellene was possible – or at least theoretically possible. This would enhance the praise from the perspective of the audience (i.e. 'it could be true ...'). In turn, this implies criteria for being or becoming Greek which unfortunately Isocrates does not give at this point. The other passages we have examined, however, strongly suggest that these criteria would be based on politics and/or culture (including religion).

not surprising. As the Greeks begin to interact with more and more people, and settle further and further afield, the criteria for identifying themselves had to evolve – consider, for example, the effect that intermarriage must have had on ‘bloodlines’ (especially over several generations). This leaves us pondering at what point mixed blood becomes an issue (in establishing a person’s identity), or whether the only requirement was to have some Greek ancestry – be it real or imagined!

This does not mean that (subjective) ancestry did not have its place. Rather, there is no doubt that common descent was nothing more than a stereotype, manipulated as required by the Greeks.³⁵ More often than not, one’s ethnic heritage was used to place one ‘above’ Barbarians. Consider, for example Plato’s comment in the *Menexenus*:

οὕτω δὴ τοι τό γε τῆς πόλεως γενναῖον καὶ ἐλεύθερον βέβαιόν τε καὶ ὑγιές ἐστιν καὶ φύσει μισοβάρβαρον, διὰ τὸ εἰλικρινῶς εἶναι Ἑλλήνας καὶ ἀμιγεῖς βαρβάρων. οὐ γὰρ Πέλοπες οὐδὲ Κάδμοι οὐδὲ Αἴγυπτοὶ τε καὶ Δαναοὶ οὐδὲ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ φύσει μὲν βάρβαροι ὄντες, νόμῳ δὲ Ἑλληνες, συνοικοῦσιν ἡμῖν, ἀλλ’ αὐτοὶ Ἑλληνες, οὐ μειξοβάρβαροι οἰκοῦσιν, ὅθεν καθαρὸν τὸ μῖσος ἐντέτηκε τῇ πόλει τῆς ἀλλοτρίας φύσεως.

Such was the nobility of the city free and strong and healthy and despising by nature Barbarians because we are pure Hellenes with no mixture of Barbarian in

³⁵ The Hellenes are a *γένος* which by definition suggests kinship (and cultural links). The invention of a common ancestor, Hellen, and his three sons Dorus, Xuthus and Aeolus (i.e. the Dorians, Ionians and Aeolians), supports the recognition of this category [See Merkelbach R. and West M.L. (Eds.) *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford, 1967) No. 9, 10 (= Rzach fr 7)]; Walbank (1951) 47]. Even in the era we are discussing ‘common blood’ has its place. Consider Pericles’ citizenship law of 451 BCE that restricted citizenship to those Athenians who had two citizen parents [Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* XXVI.3]. There can, of course, be a difference between one’s ‘citizenship’ and one’s geographic, ethnic and / or cultural origins, but this policy (regardless of ‘why’ it was implemented) does demonstrate that ‘bloodlines’ or ancestry was a way in which the Greeks grouped people. It seems probable that this law’s implementation was for political reasons. The practicality of such a law and its enforcement is, of course, an entirely separate issue. Still, its very existence does demonstrate the growing numbers of different peoples residing in Athens in the Fifth Century B.C.E. It is also interesting that Pericles’ law imposes the ‘ancestry’ requirement at a time when this criterion seems to be less important in terms of determining one’s identity. This in itself could demonstrate the ongoing tension between the different criteria for identity that we have been discussing – in particular descent (common blood) and culture. Furthermore, recognition of this ongoing tension demonstrates that there is not one definitive criterion by which we can define a people.

us. For we are not like the [the descendants of] Pelops or Cadmus or Egyptus or Danaus or many others whose nature is Barbarian, but whose customs are as Hellenes and who live among us; for we live as Hellenes, not intermixing with the Barbarians, wherefore the hatred of the foreigner is integral to the city's nature.³⁶

In this passage there is a clear distinction of superiority developed on the basis of blood: The Athenians are superior; they defeated the Persians because their bloodlines are not mixed with those of foreigners. That there is a strong rhetorical element in this oratory goes without saying: Plato is simply using a socially recognised identity marker to make a point, namely that nobility is enhanced by purity – at least in a perfect world.³⁷

Now, it is doubtful that many (if any) Athenians would take this statement literally. Argives, for example, would not be and were not categorised as Barbarians.³⁸ Plato's implication that they were is little more than an exercise in intellectual ideology which had no place in the realities of daily life. All an Athenian had to do was walk through the Agora to see that Athens was a city full of different ethnic and racial groups. We can state categorically that 'intermarriage' and the 'mixing of bloodlines' did occur –

³⁶ Plato *Menexenus* 245c-d. Translating is problematic; however, the intended meaning seems to be that the other Greeks follow Hellenic customs and live among the Athenians, but are not of pure Greek blood. Benjamin Jowett translates the passage: '... who are by nature Barbarians and yet pass for Hellenes and dwell among us ...' [Jowett B. *The Dialogues of Plato* Translated into English with Analysis and Introduction. In Four Volumes (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1871) IV. 579-80]. The descendants of Pelops are, of course, the Peloponnesians (cf. Apollodorus *Epitome* II.6-9; other details are also provided by Pindar *Olympian* I with scholia; Pausanias V.13.1-7); Cadmus refers to the Thebans (Cf. Apollodorus *The Library* III.1.1, III.4.1-2, III.5.4); and Danaus to the Argives (for the genealogy of Danaus see *FGrHist* 3 F 21; on how descendants of Danaus came to rule Argos see Horace *Odes* 3.11; Ovid *Heroides* 14). Plato's point is that each genealogy connects or associates each group with 'Barbarian' races, which makes them inferior to the Athenians: he is manipulating the genealogies in order to support an argument.

³⁷ The fact that this ideology may not represent reality does not militate against our observation, in fact provides anecdotal support. The point was to emphasise Athenian superiority. This is done through the ideology of pure bloodlines which encapsulates the dual concepts of a shared ethnicity and the inferiority of Barbarians. Our interpretation (and the purpose of Plato's rhetoric!) rests on Plato's audience's also recognising this, albeit probably subconsciously.

³⁸ Consider also that Homer uses *Δαναοί* to refer to the Hellenes as a whole! See, e.g. *Iliad*. I.42.

Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451 B.C.E. demonstrates this quite clearly.³⁹ Nevertheless, this passage is interesting for us in a number of different ways. First, the term 'Hellene' is again being defined (regardless of the criteria being used) in contrast to the 'Barbarian'. This reinforces once more (if further support were needed) that contrast with the other is a good way to categorise 'us'. Second, we can see that within the term 'Hellene' the Greeks themselves drew distinctions or developed sub-groupings, which were not necessarily evident to outsiders. Again consider the Argives: was there a non-Hellenic group that would not have categorised them as Hellenes?⁴⁰ While we will not analyse the implications of such sub-groups, recognition of their existence reinforces the complexity of the issues under discussion. Third, the criteria required to belong to a group could be and were manipulated to suit a particular author's point or for political expediency. Common descent or bloodlines are being exploited in this very way in the cited passage [Plato *Menexenus* 245c-d]; albeit Plato's distinctions are very technical and subjective. We can surmise, therefore, that ancestry can be blurred or manipulated as required so mixed heritage is not in itself a barrier to being identified as a Hellene. Finally, there is clearly a natural or ongoing tension between racial and cultural factors in group identification, but it seems to be the latter (cultural and political criteria) that are

³⁹ Pericles' Citizenship Law [see n. 35 above] while demonstrating the point made is also an example of the ideology inherent in the cited passage of Plato: Pericles is manipulating 'descent'. Furthermore, if we look beyond the technical Hellenic sub groupings that Plato creates, the above passage [Plato *Menexenus* 245c-d] is in itself evidence of Hellenes with 'mixed parentage'.

⁴⁰ Herodotus also describes how the Hellenic Race (γένος) is divided into parts (ἔθνη) [Hdt. I.143], but then goes on to describe how 'intermixing' did occur. Herodotus also demonstrates how notions of Athenian purity are questionable as he defines three criteria for being Ionian: Either 'pure birth', and/or 'of Athenian descent', and/or those 'who keep the feast Apaturia' (i.e. admitted to a 'phratry') [Hdt. I.147]. Both 'Athenian Descent' (which is a vague term suggesting ancestry acceptable to the community) and participation in the Feast of Apaturia indicate that community acceptance and adoption of cultural practices are what really matters in classifying to which group a person belongs.

becoming more important in the day-to-day classification of people: Isocrates' statement [*Panegyricus* 50] is a clear witness to this evolution.

In the late fourth century B.C.E. the social, political and cultural climate changes again. This is the time of Alexander's campaign and the establishment of the so-called successor kingdoms. From this time on there is a significant Hellenic presence in the East as Greeks settle widely bringing their 'way of life' with them.⁴¹ This is a process that emphasises the importance of Hellenic culture to identity. Consider, for example, how in Alexandria Hellenes became known as 'those from the gymnasium' [οἱ ἀπὸ γυμνασίου] and often had non-Greek names thereby suggesting a non-Greek ancestry.⁴² Another example demonstrating the role of culture over geography and bloodlines is Antiochus I who was demonstrably half-Iranian and raised in Babylon, yet is considered a Hellene.⁴³

The other side to this discussion is how the peoples in the East (in the Hellenistic period) viewed or defined the Greeks, after all what we have discussed is what the *Greeks*

⁴¹ For some initial observations on the spread of 'Hellenic Culture' and 'Hellenism' in the so-called 'Hellenistic Period' see the Introduction. Some points are worth noting here again briefly: First, Alexander did not set out with a missionary-like zeal to spread Greek culture amongst the peoples of the east. The spread of Hellenism was a consequence of Alexander's conquest and the establishment of the successor kingdoms. Second, Hellenic Culture did not arrive into a vacuum. Local customs and cultures existed well before the arrival of the Greeks and continued to exist throughout their rule. Both the Eastern peoples and the Greeks borrowed parts of each other's way of life – adapting social practices and beliefs to their own needs. Third, there is a close relationship between 'Hellenism' and 'Hellene', especially since (as we have been discovering) a Hellene was being defined more and more in terms of his/her culture.

⁴² Walbank (1951) 45.

⁴³ Antiochus I was half Iranian (Seleucus and Apama) and was raised in Babylon in the Achaemenid palaces used by his father. As Bernard notes Antiochus I never knew Greece and was probably influenced by the 'Greek-Oriental' ambience in which he had lived [Bernard P. 'Les traditions orientales dans l'architecture Gréco-Bactrienne'. In *JA* 264 (1976) 245-75, for points raised see Pp. 257, and Sherwin-White S. 'Seleucid Babylonia: A Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule'. In A. Kuhrt et al. [eds.] (1987) 1-31, esp. 7-8.]. Furthermore, the Seleucids maintained blood links with the Iranian classes adopting a policy of arranging dynastic marriages with contemporary Iranian dynasts of Anatolia [Sherwin-White (1987) 7; Walbank F.W. *The Hellenistic World* (London, 1981) 125]. Yet we (and the ancient peoples in the East) consider the Seleucids as Hellenes!

consider to be Hellenic. To a large extent this is the result of our evidence: we are analysing Greek literature in order to define the Hellenes. Therefore, we can only get a Greek perspective. Our analysis of Second Maccabees (as a text written by a Jew) will begin to redress this issue. This notwithstanding there are some comments we can make now. First, it is clear that the tension between cultural and blood or descent issues was a real and difficult concept for the Greeks in defining who they were, so for an outsider (Jew or 'Barbarian') the confusion must have been even more pronounced. In these circumstances it seems reasonable to assume that the outsider can only be left with observation when attempting to identify to which group a person belonged. With this in mind, culture as represented by an individual's choices, actions and dress (i.e. what s/he looks like), must be the key criteria for a Jew to categorise a Hellene. This would also mean that when a person is labelled an Hellene his or her subsequent actions/practices could be understood as 'Hellenic' (regardless of the reality).

Second, it is apparent that the need for such self definition escalates at times when the Hellenes come into extensive contact with the 'other', and that their subsequent interaction meant that the criteria for identity became based more on culture than geography or blood. This demonstrate a process – how a people categorised the world and themselves, and how the understanding of who they and others were was based on fluid criteria that evolved over time. Furthermore, we have seen how this process can be identified in the perceptions that are inherent in any text. While we have acknowledged that no two peoples are the same, our arguments and methodology in defining the 'Hellene' are relevant to most studies of historical texts and people, regardless of the time.

This latter point is particularly interesting. Many authors warn against drawing analogies between the Hellenic experience and the Jewish one – usually because they equate the term 'Jew' with religion. While such warnings have merit, we have been

careful to place an emphasis on methodology. Our discussion has been of a 'process' or, for want of a better descriptive phrase, a 'problematic equation'. Therefore, even if the experiences of two peoples differ in particulars, the method of analysis can be the same for both. Furthermore, in our study there are also similarities in circumstances that make the process we are using even more relevant. First, the Jews and the Greeks both spread themselves over vast geographic areas, thereby settling amongst many different peoples and exposing themselves to many different ways of life.⁴⁴ Second, that the Hellenic culture came into direct contact and 'influenced' Jewish culture and therefore how the Jews identified themselves. This argument has merit regardless of whether we view the Jewish – Hellenic 'interaction' in terms of 'conflict' or not. We cannot, for example, escape the fact that the author of Second Maccabees wrote in Greek!

We can tentatively suggest, therefore, that the Hellenic experience may be beneficial in understanding the Jewish one or, at least, provide a window (as opposed to a mirror) into their society. As we noted above, the process that we have established for reading and understanding Herodotus can be used for other texts – the underlying principle, after all, is context: be it Hellenic or Eastern. With all this in mind, let us pursue this discussion a little further by applying it to the Jews/Judaeans. We will then be in a position to relate our particular methodology and questions to the text of Second Maccabees itself.

⁴⁴ Fishman J.A. 'Language and Identity in Bilingual Education' In W.C. McReady [Ed.] *Culture, Ethnicity and Identity: Current Issues in Research* (New York, London, Paris; 1983) 127-137, esp. 130-2. See also Hall [(1989) 5], although her objections on the grounds of religion can be queried in light of Herodotus' recognition that common gods (or God in the Jewish case!) is an ethnographic criterion for understanding a group's identity.

Chapter Two

Self Identification: Toward a Definition of the Ἰουδαῖοι

Ἰουδαῖοι

Until recently the term Ἰουδαῖοι has tended to be translated as ‘Jews’.¹ Yet, the interpretation of the term ‘Jews’ itself is subjective: there are religious, cultural and/or political associations – not to mention modern influences. As a result in the last twenty years or so the accepted translation (as ‘Jews’) has come under increased scrutiny, with more importance being attached to the geographic/ethnic association that the term clearly incorporates. In other words, Ἰουδαῖοι has come to be translated as ‘Judaean’.² Admittedly this reading has some merit. It is clear that Ἰουδαῖος was the Greek translation for the Hebrew *Yehudi*, which is best understood (at least in a literal sense) as: ‘a member of the tribe of Judah’. So we have an ethnic and, to a certain extent, geographic link: the country/homeland, Judah, has the same name as the tribe. Numerous other sources confirm this interpretation, and Josephus even makes a direct association:

Καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς τὸ ἔργον παρεσκευάζοντο. ἐκλήθησαν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα ἐξ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀνέβησαν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰούδα φυλῆς, τῆς πρώτης ἐλθούσης εἰς ἐκείνους τοὺς τόπους αὐτοὶ τε καὶ ἡ χώρα τὴν προσηγορίαν αὐτῆς μετέλαβον.

‘And the Ἰουδαῖοι prepared for the work. This name [Ἰουδαῖοι], by which they have been called from the day when they went up from Babylon, is derived from

¹ Kraemer R.S. ‘On the Meaning of “Jew” In Greco-Roman Inscriptions’ *HTR* Vol. 82 (1989) 35-53 see Pp. 35; Kraabel suggests a more complicated interpretation including geographic origin i.e. ‘Judaean’ [Kraabel (1982) 445-64]; Cohen (1999): ‘Greek *Ioudaios* and Latin *Iudaeus* (or *Iudeus*) are usually translated as “Jew”’ [Pp. 69]. Individuals named *Ioudaios* or *Iuda* (Juda[h]) are not considered in our study, see Kraemer (1989) 35-53.

² See Cohen (1999) 69-106 esp. 82ff, primary and secondary references are cited therein. See also discussion and references in Pearce et al. (1998) 13-28; Jones (1998) 29-49. S. Mason the Editor of the Brill Josephus Commentaries translates Ἰουδαῖοι as Judaean – see (e.g.) the titles in the series (*Judaean War*, *Judaean Antiquities*).

the tribe of Judah; as this tribe was the first to come to those parts, both the people themselves and the country have taken their name from it'.³

Josephus understood, therefore, that Ἰουδαῖοι could be understood in the same way that we interpret Egyptians (as the 'people from Egypt'), the Syrians (as the 'people from Syria'); etc. This also suggests that Ἰουδαῖος is a term that has a meaning, in Greek, associated with ἔθνος: A people are united by a common ancestry and geography. While we can demonstrate that Josephus also recognises a cultural dimension⁴, he is here at the very least presenting his interpretation, as a First Century C.E. author, regarding how Ἰουδαῖοι was understood in the early Sixth Century B.C.E. By the Third Century C.E., however, Ἰουδαῖοι had developed to mean something completely different or had at least expanded in meaning to include a very strong (if not over-riding) religious/cultural focus. In a passage from the *Historia Romana* Cassius Dio makes it clear that one could be a Jew based on cultural criteria alone:

... ἡ τε γὰρ χώρα Ἰουδαία καὶ αὐτοὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ὠνομάδονται· (17.1) ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ κλησὶς αὕτη ἐκείνοις μὲν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ἤξατο γενέσθαι, φέρει δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ὅσοι τὰ νόμιμα αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἄλλοεθνεῖς ὄντες, ζηλοῦσι.

'... the country is called "Judaea" and the people themselves Ἰουδαῖοι. I do not know how this name came to be applied to them, but it is valid also for as many other men, even if they should be *of another race*, as practise their customs.'⁵

³ Josephus *Antiquities* XI.173. See also Clearchus [Fragment preserved by Josephus *Against Apionem* I.176-183 (esp. 179)] and Polybius infers an association between the Jewish nation and the lands around Jerusalem [Fragment preserved by Josephus *Antiquities* XII.135-136 = Polybius *Histories* XVI.1.3-4] as in Stern (1976) I.15 (Pp. 49ff) and I.32 (Pp. 113ff) respectively. Note Cohen (1999) 71-2. It is, of course debatable as to which came first the tribe called Judah, which gave its name to the land; or the territory, which gave its name to the tribe.

⁴ See e.g. Cohen (1989) 27.

⁵ Cassius Dio *Historia Romana* XXXVII.16.5ff = Stern (1980) II.406 (Trans. E. Cary) – emphasis added. See also comments by Cohen S.J.D. 'Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew' *HTR* Vol. 82 (1989) 13-33, esp. 21. Of course, whether Jews in Judaea saw such people as 'Jews' is another matter!

Clearly for Cassius Dio becoming a Ἰουδαῖος was a matter of adopting religious practices and customs: culture defines who people are or to what group they belong. Therefore, if we compare the interpretation of Ἰουδαῖος evident in the two passages we have cited it becomes clear that, at some point, there was an evolution in meaning; i.e. Ἰουδαῖος develops from primarily a geographic/lineage focus to a religious/cultural one.⁶ In terms of modern labelling this is analogous to the accepted or ‘better’ translation of Ἰουδαῖος being ‘Jew’ rather than ‘Judaean’.

In his book *The Beginnings of Jewishness* Shaye Cohen recognises and discusses this evolution.⁷ He suggests that the use of Ἰουδαῖοι in the sense of ‘Jews’ – with the corresponding cultural, religious and/or political sense – only began in the late Second Century B.C.E. with (importantly for our study) the first example occurring in Second Maccabees. In making this argument Cohen presents two instances in Second Maccabees where Ἰουδαῖοι could be translated as ‘Jews’. One is questionable and we will return to it later. The other, however, seems to be a good interpretation.⁸ It occurs during the account of the demise of Antiochus on his return from Persia. According to the author of Second Maccabees when Antiochus is near death he makes a series of solemn promises to the Jews (or Judaeans): Specifically, that he will give them citizenship rights equal to

⁶ It is interesting that in many respects this evolution parallels that which we have seen occurred with relation to the term ‘Hellene’. The parallel appears to confirm our hypothesis that we can perhaps learn something from our earlier analysis, at least in terms of methodology.

⁷ Shaye Cohen’s study is excellent and has been very well reviewed. It is not my intent in the forthcoming discussion to discredit his entire analysis (with which, for the most part, I am in agreement). For an indicative review see: Sivan H. ‘What has Jerusalem to do with Rome (Or Athens For That Matter)?’ In *BMC R* (1999.07.21). Note, especially Sivan’s concluding remark: ‘... no scholar interested in issues of [Jewish] identity, self-definition, core and periphery, community and law, family, class and gender in antiquity can afford to give Cohen a miss’.

⁸ II Macc. VI.6 (discussed at Chapter Three n.25, this thesis) and IX.17. See Cohen (1999) 92-3.

those of the people of Athens as well as gifts for the Temple and that he will meet the cost of sacrifices from his own revenues [II Macc. IX.11ff]. Most importantly, it is also reported that:

... πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ Ἰουδαῖον ἔσεσθαι, καὶ πάντα τόπον οἰκητὸν ἐπελεύσεσθαι καταγγέλλοντα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος.

‘In addition, he [Antiochus] would even become a Ἰουδαῖος and visit every inhabited place to proclaim God’s might’.

[II Macc. IX.17]

Now, this is a remarkable assertion: the king, our author suggests, promises to become a Ἰουδαῖος [Ἰουδαῖον ἔσεσθαι]. While there can be little doubt that the episode as described is fictional (and the entire passage heavy with irony, even on his death bed Antiochus still did not comprehend what ‘being a Jew’ entailed: the Jews did not want to be Athenians), yet the phrase Ἰουδαῖον ἔσεσθαι would still need to be comprehensible to its intended audience. It is possible to translate Ἰουδαῖος as it is used in this passage as ‘Judaean’: ‘He [Antiochus] would even be a [or ‘be as a’ / ‘become as a’] Judaean’. However, even with this translation the sense of Judaean that is meant is one based on culture and religious practice. Antiochus was not and could not become Judaean ethnically (in terms of lineage or bloodlines), nor is it realistic to expect him to join the tribe of Judah and to reside in the holy land (i.e. become part of the ἔθνος). Antiochus was a Seleucid king with Macedonian and some, albeit distant, Persian lineage (ethnicity).⁹ Taking these observations into account the only reasonable translation for

⁹ Seleucus I kept his wife (Apama) from the marriage ceremony that Alexander arranged in 324 B.C.E. Antiochus IV was the great-great-great-grandson of Seleucus I and Apama; see Grainger J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer* (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1997). It has been suggested that future generations kept up a blood link with the Iranian Upper classes through dynastic marriages in Asia Minor: See Sherwin-White S. ‘Seleucid Babylon’. In A. Kuhrt et al. (1987) 1-31; esp. 7ff. *Contra*. See Walbank (1981) 125, Momigliano (1975) Chapter 6 esp. 137ff.

Ἰουδαῖος is 'Jew', in terms of a religious and to an extent cultural conversion. He would abide by the laws of God and offer sacrifices to the one true God. Antiochus could turn or become a Jew in this context, but it is difficult to contend that he became a Judaeon.¹⁰

This means that by the mid to late Second Century B.C.E. Ἰουδαῖοι could mean 'Jews' and have a religious, and probably a cultural, association. Despite assertions otherwise this is not the earliest example we have of this interpretation. In 'Bel and the Snake', for example, Daniel convinces the Babylonian king that Bel was a false god. We then receive a description of his subjects' reaction:

Καὶ συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας πάντες ἐπὶ τὸν Δανιηλ καὶ εἶπαν Ἰουδαῖος γέγονεν ὁ βασιλεὺς· τὸν βῆλ κατέστρεψε καὶ τὸν δράκοντα ἀπέκτεινε.

'And everyone from the land [i.e. the Babylonians] was aggrieved with Daniel, and they shouted, "The king has become a Jew. He has destroyed Bel and killed the snake".'¹¹

Cohen dismisses this example arguing that the king has not turned 'Jew', but is acting like a 'Judaeon'. His reasoning is that 'Bel and the Snake' must be understood in terms of the Book of Daniel: the king is seen to be acting like a Judaeon – that is, like

¹⁰ See Cohen (1999) 92-3.

¹¹ Daniel *Bel and the Snake* 28. The date of 'Bel and the Snake' is disputed. Recent scholarship suggests that the tales were composed, originally, in a Semitic language and that an origin in the Persian period is likely. The tales were probably developed as an haggadic or priestly exposition of Jeremiah 51: 34-35, 44 [= LXX Jeremiah 28: 34-35,44]. The narrative probably took its present form in the mid-second century B.C.E. See Moore C.A. *Daniel, Esther, Jeremiah: The Additions*. The Anchor Bible Series (Double Day: New York, 1977) 119-129; Cohen (1999) 85 n. 48. Eissfeldt comments that the stories in 'Bel and the Snake' contain earlier folktale motifs (e.g. footprints appearing in ashes) and that the second story may well be based on a far earlier Babylonian saga [(1966) 589-90]. Regardless, the intended audience was almost certainly Jewish, and it was probably written by a Jew in Palestine, all of which suggests that the possibility of a gentile (in this case the Babylonian king) 'turning Jew' was acceptable – otherwise the story would be nonsensical! Cf. Moore (1977) 127-8. Finally, this text is very different from Theodotian's version, although it is interesting to note that the key phrase [Ἰουδαῖος γέγονεν ὁ βασιλεὺς] remains the same in both versions.

Daniel – who is ‘of the sons of Judah’ [Dan I.6] or ‘from Judah’ [Dan. I.6 LXX]. Now, there is no doubt that context is important, but in this situation the use of the ‘Book of Daniel’ to interpret the meaning of this passage draws on (at best) a vague connection. It is doubtful an audience would immediately understand the text in such a way. Rather, the context that the intended audience would most probably place and understand this story in, is undoubtedly religious. First and foremost ‘Bel and the Snake’ is about religion and the folly of idol worship.¹² Therefore, the Babylonians’ accusation [Ἰουδαῖος γέγονεν ὁ βασιλεύς] refers to their king’s accepting the religious beliefs of the Jews (or Daniel to place the story in the context of the Book of Daniel as well). The term ‘Jew’ encapsulates this change better than ‘Judaean’.

To confirm our assessment we can also compare this account of the Babylonian king in ‘Bel and the Snake’ with that of Antiochus in Second Maccabees. The arguments we made rejecting the possibilities of a Macedonian king ‘becoming Judaean’ are equally valid with regard to the Babylonian king. The Babylonians knew the lineage of their king (he was not a Judaean), but he could be described as ‘turning Jew’ through his rejection of the traditional religion and his acceptance of Daniel’s claims.¹³ This means that we have another passage where the term ‘Jew’ provides the better translation.

We can also look significantly earlier for a link between religion and what it meant to belong to the tribe of Judah. Consider the numerous passages from the Bible that extol the virtues of following God’s law. Certainly, these same passages also often

¹² *Bel and the Snake* is essentially two (or possibly three) stories; regardless, throughout Daniel demonstrates to the king the falseness or pointlessness of idol worship.

¹³ In fairness to Cohen he does note that the term ‘Jew’ fits the passage very well and does make the concession that ‘the meaning “Jew” is beginning to emerge’. He does however opt for ‘Judaean’ as the correct translation. [Cohen (1999) 86-7; quote from Pp. 87]. Later in the same book Cohen appears to be in two minds wanting to associate the term ‘Jew’ with the passage, although still insisting that ‘Judaean’ is technically correct – see Cohen (1999) 153.

describe Israel as the promised land and create an undeniable link between the people and geography, yet it is clear that this 'connection' became driven more by idealism.¹⁴ Daily reality would and did allow for the separation of a people and their homeland. The best starting point for analysing this evolution in identity seems to be 587/6 B.C.E. – the beginning of the Babylonian exile.

The destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of its people was, undoubtedly, a traumatic upheaval that changed nearly every aspect of the old Jewish community. In short, the physical displacement and dispersal of the Judaeans / Jewish people resulted in their identity evolving (both as perceived by them as a people and as they were seen by others). Specifically, the Jews re-evaluated their traditions and laws, and then strictly adhered to them as re-evaluated. This singled them out or marked them as a distinct group, regardless of where they were. Consider, for example, how adherence to perceived traditional values such as the Sabbath and circumcision probably increased in importance during and after the exile. To some extent such traditions became 'the mark of a Jew' and

¹⁴ The references detailing the importance of the covenant to the people of Israel are numerous. Consider, e.g. Exodus XIX.5ff: 'You will be for me a kingdom of Priests and a Holy nation'. Furthermore, all the laws or codes listed in the Old Testament (Exodus XX.22-3, XXXIII; Leviticus XVII – XXVI, etc.) evince theological principles underlying the very existence of the people of Israel: see Ackroyd (1970) 95. Deuteronomy VI.4ff provides a clear connection between the Lord bringing the people of Israel to the land and the requirement for them to obey his word. Isaiah makes much of a new covenant between God and his people (e.g. Isaiah LIV.9-10, LV.3-5) and the rebuilding of Jerusalem (e.g. Isaiah XLIV.26-28) thereby indicating the importance of the city and the region Judaea. Jeremiah's condemnation of social evils and neglect of the Lord is also tied up with the prospect of reclaiming the land of Judaea [VII.1ff]. These are only a few illustrative instances of the association between God, the people of Israel and the geographic region of Judaea; as noted earlier there are many examples. For a starting place in the secondary literature see Ackroyd P.R. *Exile And Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (SCM Press, London: 1968) 113 ff. (Land and People), 135; Anderson G.W. 'Canonical And Non-Canonical'. In P.R. Ackroyd & C.F. Evans [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of the Bible Vol. One: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1970) 113-159 esp. 120-121; Kaiser O. *Introduction To the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems* Translated by J. Sturdy (Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, 1975) 15-21, 267-8 (message of Deutero-Isaiah); Pfeiffer R.H. *Introduction To The Old Testament* (Adam and Charles Black: London, 1948) 148, 472ff; Schürer (1979) II.464-466.

formed the basis for community development.¹⁵ The devastating events also brought about a re-editing of the Deuteronomistic Historical Corpus [Deuteronomy – II Kings] in order to account for what had happened and to provide a way forward – strict adherence to Yahweh’s covenant.¹⁶

Certainly the promise of a possible return to Judaea is also expounded. However, since the ‘way’ in which this return will be achieved is once more through strict adherence to God’s law, there is little doubt that we have yet another illustration of how the exiled Jewish community developed and reinforced its distinct identity. To be specific, the sharing of a common dream bound the Jews together. Meantime, the need to partake in unique practices in order to achieve the goal of returning to Judaea further segregated them from other peoples and marked them as Jews. This, at least, seems to be the message carried by the literature of the time.¹⁷ Consider for example, Psalm 137, where the psalmist is recalling how, by the rivers of Babylon they (the Jews / Judaeans) had longed for home and asked: ‘How shall we sing the song of the Lord in a foreign land?’ [Πῶς ᾄσωμεν τὴν ᾠδὴν Κυρίου ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλλοτρίας;].¹⁸ The ‘song of the Lord’, of course, refers to how the Israelites came, through the mighty acts of the Lord (Yahweh),

¹⁵ This is pointed out by Bright J. *A History of Israel* Third Edition (Westminster Press: Philadelphia, (1981) 349. Examples relating to the importance of the Sabbath include e.g. Jeremiah. 17.19-27; Isaiah. 56.1-8, 58.13ff; Circumcision e.g. Genesis 17.9-14. Bright stresses that these ‘traditional customs’ receive for more emphasis during and after the exile: ‘... stress on law is understandable among the exiles, for now that nation and cult had ended there was little else to mark them Jews’ [p 349]. Ackroyd (1968) 35ff is far more cautious in his appraisal of whether circumcision and/or the Sabbath did become more important, although he does acknowledge that they would have been re-examined and re-evaluated in the exilic age.

¹⁶ The original corpus was probably written in Palestine in the years just preceding the exile (622-587?) and was then most likely re-edited post 587. See Bright (1981) 333, 350. For an introductory discussion on the unity of the Deuteronomistic History and further discussion on its dating see Kaiser (1975) 169-75.

¹⁷ See e.g. the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel; the Psalms (Psalm 137 is discussed below). See especially Ackroyd (1968) *passim*.

to occupy the promised land and be a people. Therefore, in many respects, this single line demonstrates the strong link between religion, country (Judah), and identity.¹⁹ This in turn means that both religion and geography are distinct components in Jewish / Judaeen identity.²⁰ Furthermore, there is also a subtle recognition that in a 'foreign land' the importance of religion as a marker of identity is significantly increased.²¹

This interpretation is supported by other circumstantial evidence. First, there is an apparent change in the nomenclature of Babylonian Jews: fathers begin to invoke Yahweh more when naming their sons.²² Second, we have the expansive growth of the Diaspora, especially in the late Persian and Hellenistic periods. The establishment of Jewish communities throughout the Mediterranean and in the East was not always forced or, even if the initial movement was under compulsion, the growth of these communities was often voluntary.

¹⁸ Ps. 137.4. The timeframe is, of course, after the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E.

¹⁹ For discussions on this Psalm see Sabourin L.S.J. *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning* (New York, 1974) 318ff; and Weiser A. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Translated from the German *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen, 1959). The Old Testament Library (London, 1962) 793ff.

²⁰ Consider, for example the hanging up of their harps and refusal to sing [Ps. 137.2-3] as well as the longing for home [Ps. 137.4]. Who the Jews are is encapsulated in the need to 'sing the Lord's song' and to return to the 'promised land'. Of course, the Psalm is also about maintaining the sacredness of the Lord's songs and not degrading their holiness by performing them as entertainment for the local populace. See Weiser (1962) 795. Note that this in itself highlights the importance of religion to the Jewish / Judaeen people.

²¹ Not obvious from this line in isolation but a consequence or an undercurrent of the Psalm as a whole. See Collins (1982) 1ff, who uses this line [Ps. 137.4] to begin his discussion on Jewish identity.

²² According to the Murashu records Jewish fathers who, for whatever reason, bear idolatrous names (such as 'Beluballit' – 'the god Bel called to life'), tend to invoke 'Yahweh' in their sons' names (Beluballit names his son 'Nathaniah' – 'Yahweh has given'). This suggests a strengthening of their own religious beliefs (despite being in a foreign land) and a rejection of Babylonian practices and beliefs (unlike the actions of the Assyrian and Egyptian exiles). See Bickerman E.J. 'The Babylonian Captivity'. In W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Vol. One Introduction, The Persian Period* (Cambridge, 1984) 342-358, esp. 355-357.

The best illustration of the development of these communities can be found in the events which occurred at the end of the exile. In 539 B.C.E. Cyrus captured Babylon and brought the whole of the Babylonian Empire – including Palestine – under his control. In 538 B.C.E. Cyrus issued a decree restoring the Jewish community and cult in Palestine.²³ However, the invitation to return to Judaea was not welcomed or at least followed up by all the Jews living in Babylon. Some thirty years later it is clear that the Temple had not been rebuilt. We are informed by Erza that Darius I discovered a scroll relating to Cyrus' decree in the Babylonian archives and as a result set about reinvigorating Cyrus' policy by rebuilding the Temple [Erza VI.1ff]. This notwithstanding, in the time of Nehemiah we learn that: 'The city [Jerusalem] was large and palatial, yet there were few people in it and no houses had been rebuilt' [καὶ ἡ πόλις πλατεῖα καὶ μεγάλη, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὀλίγος ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν οἰκίαι ὀικοδομημέναι].²⁴ Even allowing for the chronological questions, the earliest that Nehemiah could have been writing was sometime in the 440's B.C.E. Therefore, even by the mid-fifth century B.C.E. the Jews had not returned in large

²³ There are two reports of the 'edict of restoration': Erza I.2-4 and VI.3-5. The memorandum at Erza VI.3-5 refers to a decree of Cyrus that permitted the Jews to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple; while the former reference purports to be a copy of that decree. The debate continues concerning the reliability of the paraphrase at Erza I.2-4, but the existence of a decree by Cyrus allowing the Jews to return to Jerusalem is widely accepted. For a discussion and references to the relevant literature see Bright (1981) 361ff; Pfeiffer (1948) 823ff who questions the authenticity of Erza VI.3-5. Ackroyd (1968) 142ff suggests that Erza I.2-4 was rewritten by the Chronicler to 'fit in with his conception of the actual nature of the restoration as indicated at the end of II Chronicles 36' [142]. As Ackroyd then goes on to note, modification and interpretation does not necessarily mean the introduction of erroneous information [143 n. 21]. Bickerman also has a good discussion with references: Bickerman E. 'The Edict of Cyrus in Erza'. In *Studies In Jewish And Christian History* In Three Volumes (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1976) 72-108. Support as to the occurrence of a proclamation is provided by the Cyrus Cylinder [See Pritchard J.B. [Ed.] *The Ancient Near East: An Anthology of Texts And Pictures* Vol. I (Princeton, 1958) 206-8 (=ANET 315-6)].

²⁴ Nehemiah VII.4 [Esdras II 17.4]. The Books of Erza and Nehemiah have in themselves been the subject of extensive debate, most of which we do not have to address here. Suffice it to say that they at least give an indication of the social and historical situation at the time when they wrote (probably mid- to late-fifth Century B.C.E.). For more, see (as a good starting point) Williamson H.G.M. *Word Biblical Commentary: Erza, Nehemiah* (Word Books: Texas, 1985) which has an extensive bibliography.

numbers to their 'homeland'. In short, the most probable scenario seems to be that even though Cyrus officially ended the exile few left Babylon. Some Jews began to drift back in the reign of Darius I, but the real return did not begin until under Artaxerxes II.²⁵ This suggests that any Jewish connection with Judaea has more to do with idealistic notions than reality.

Another interesting case-study is the city of Alexandria. Even though the initial settlement of this city may have been due to forced migration, the subsequent growth of the Jewish population in Alexandria was certainly not.²⁶ Despite the obvious exaggeration of the numbers quoted, Philo makes it clear just how vast the Diaspora had become by the First Century C.E, suggesting: 'That there were no less than a million Jews resident in Alexandria and the country from the slope into Libya to the boundaries of Ethiopia' [ὅτι οὐκ ἀποδέουσι μυριάδων ἑκατὸν οἱ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ τὴν χώραν Ἰουδαῖοι κατοικοῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς Λιβύην καταβαθμοῦ μέχρι τῶν ὁρίων Αἰθιοπίας].²⁷ Not only is Philo here demonstrating that migration had been occurring for some time (in order for such numbers to be reached), but his example – Alexandria – is illustrative of

²⁵ The initial reluctance to move despite Cyrus' proclamation is apparently well-known at a much later time. Josephus, for example, makes it clear that at the end of the exile many Jews were well established in their new homes, choosing to remain in Babylon: 'they were not willing to leave their possessions' [πολλὰ γὰρ κατέμειναν ἐν τῇ Βαβυλῶνι, τὰ κτήματα καταλιπεῖν οὐ θέλοντες. (Josephus *Antiquities* XI.1.3 [8])]. Also in the following century Jewish names also appear frequently in business documents in Babylon. See Coogan M.D. 'Life in the Diaspora' In *The Biblical Archaeologist* 37 (1974) 6-12; Ackroyd (1968) 144ff; Bright (1981) 362ff; 375-6.

²⁶ Jewish settlement in Egypt may have begun under forced migration by Ptolemy I [cf. *The Letter of Aristeas* XIIff]. Evidence of voluntary settlement also exists [cf. Josephus *Against Apion* I.186-7; for settlement under Alexander and for Jews' receiving the same rights as Greeks see Josephus *Against Apion* II.35, *B.J.* II.487]. All these passages are problematic, but some initial compulsion seems likely [see Tcherikover (1959) 269-73]. The continued success and growth of the population indicates eventual voluntary migration [see Collins (1982) 3].

²⁷ Philo *Against Flaccus* 43. A little later Philo comments: 'For the Jews are so populous no one country is able to hold them [Ἰουδαίους γὰρ χώρα μία διὰ πολυανθρωπίας οὐ χωρεῖ]' [*Against Flaccus* 45].

what was happening throughout the rest of the known world: Jews were present and their numbers growing and not under compulsion. Under this scenario it is incomprehensible that settlers leaving Jerusalem would no longer be able to practise their religion simply because they now dwelt 'in a foreign land'.

This is an assumption supported by the Book of Tobit. This (probable) Third Century B.C.E. (Palastinean) Jewish text²⁸, is witness to a people spread amongst the nations who continue to practise and live by their beliefs. As demonstrative consider the prayer made by Tobit towards the end of the book. First clear reference is made to the dispersal of the Jews/Judaeans:

Ἐξομολογεῖσθε αὐτῷ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὅτι αὐτὸς διέσπειρεν ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτοῖς.

'Confess Him before the Gentiles, children of Israel, for He has scattered us among them'.²⁹

Second, the need to practise their religion in the Diaspora is emphasised. This is indicated above: '*Confess Him* before the other nations ...' (emphasis added). It is also made more directly a little bit later:

ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας μου ἐξομολογοῦμαι αὐτῷ, καὶ δεικνύω τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὴν μεγαλυσύνην αὐτοῦ ἔθνει ἀμαρτωλῶν.

'In the land of my captivity do I confess Him and declare His might and majesty to a nation of sinners.'³⁰

²⁸ Both the date and place of origin of The Book of Tobit are subject to extensive discussion with estimates of the date ranging from the Seventh Century B.C.E. to the Third Century C.E. and possible places of composition covering the Eastern world, from Egypt to Media. Discussion of the possibilities with reference to the appropriate literature, as well as the case for a Third century B.C.E. date and Palestinian provenance is made by Moore C.A. *Tobit: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary* The Anchor Bible (Double Day: New York, 1996), see especially Pp. 40-43.

²⁹ Tobit XIII.3, emphasis added. This text is based on Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus.

³⁰ Tobit XIII.8. This text is based on Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus; it is not in Codex Sinaiticus.

Numerous other passages in the text support the need for the Jews / Judaeans to practise their religion in the lands in which they now dwell. Certainly the text also demonstrates the belief that God will one day lead his people home to the 'promised land', thereby reinforcing a connection between the people and a geographic area.³¹ There is no need to deny this connection although as we have noted it is clear that the link is little more than prophetic idealism. What is interesting for us is that the expressed desire to follow God's law in foreign lands seems to reflect the reality of the situation that the people found themselves in. These passages from Tobit seem to reinforce the idea that identity was no longer directly, or perhaps as strongly, linked to geography but more reliant on adhering to particular beliefs and customs.

All of these examples make it clear that in the Persian period and into the Hellenistic period the Jewish / Judaeans people were struggling to make sense of events and maintain their identity. Their dispersal, both forced and voluntary, helps demonstrate how the meaning of 'Ιουδαῖοι could have developed from a primarily geographic one to one which incorporated strong cultural ideas. Geography – especially the Temple and Jerusalem – indisputably is important to the Jews and at all times remains linked to the term 'Ιουδαῖοι. The material that we have discussed does not militate against this, rather our arguments demonstrate that the religious, cultural and political meaning of 'Ιουδαῖοι began to develop considerably earlier than some recent scholarship suggests.

Therefore, as far as translation of 'Ιουδαῖοι is concerned, the process we have discussed suggests that the term 'Jews' rather than 'Judaeans' best captures the social developments that were occurring in Judaeans society as early as the Persian period. This

³¹ Examples of other passages supporting either the spread of the Jewish people through foreign lands and/or the need to praise the Lord in these lands include: E.g. Tobit XIII.4; XIV.4. Tobit goes on to mention how God will gather the Jewish people out of all the nations and lead them back to the chosen land – cf. Tobit XIII.5, 13; XIV.5. It is worthwhile stressing again that the importance of geography is not being denied, but a geographic connection does not militate against our arguments.

does not mean that we have to advocate a strict either-or dichotomy, both translations and their respective associations with geography and culture (represented by religion in our above discussion) do seem to have their place.³² Be that as it may, by the Second Century B.C.E. and the composition of Second Maccabees we should accept that 'Jews' is the standard meaning of Ἰουδαῖοι. The evidence we have cited does not support the argument that the concepts inherent in the term 'Jews' are still new or innovative in mid Second Century B.C.E. texts.³³

Jew and Gentile

There is another dimension to any analysis of Ἰουδαῖοι: the relationship with foreigners. We have seen that the Greeks labelled the other peoples of the world as Barbarians. The Jews too created a distinction between themselves and the non-Jews, 'foreigners' or 'other nations'. The distinction is most readily apparent in the early Christian translation of the Hebrew *goy/goyyim* as 'Gentile/s'. In the earliest books of the Old Testament *goy* simply means 'nation' and was even used, on occasion, to refer to Israel.³⁴ In time, however, it seems to have been used more for non-Israelite groups.³⁵ The Christian translation of 'Goy' as 'Gentile' is derived from the Latin 'gens', which equates to the Greek ἔθνος or 'nation'. It seems, therefore, that 'Gentile' was an attempt at a

³² Consider Kraemer's comments while introducing his paper 'On the Meaning of "Jew" in Greco-Roman Inscriptions': 'A careful look at the occurrence of these terms in Greek and Latin Jewish inscriptions suggests that rather than sustain only one uniform translation *Ioudaia/Ioudaios* may have a range of connotations' [(1989) 35].

³³ As Cohen suggests [(1999) 92-3]. We will undertake a detailed study of Second Maccabees in the following section to test this hypothesis.

³⁴ Cf. Genesis XII.2; Exodus XXIII.28; XXXIII.2; XXXIV.11; etc.

³⁵ Cf. Exodus XXXIV.24; Numbers XXIV.8; Deuteronomy IX.4; etc.

literal translation of the Hebrew ‘Goy’.³⁶ At any rate, the way in which the meaning of *goyyim* developed, as in referring to foreign peoples, and the negativity (from a Jewish perspective) that came to be associated with the term helps demonstrate the ideological separation between Jew and non-Jew (again from a Jewish perspective).

The Jewish categorisation into ‘us’ and ‘them’ is evident from numerous direct statements in the literature as well as the archaeological record. We have, for example, a late first century C.E. tomb inscription from Tlos (Lycia) which clearly indicates that a certain Ptolemy son of Leukios built the tomb for the burial of Jews and *only* Jews.³⁷ Furthermore, Josephus repeatedly refers to ‘us Jews’ and ‘foreigners’ implying a strong sense of difference.³⁸ Philo of Alexandria is more direct in his division of society, separating the inhabitants of Egypt into two distinct groups, ‘us’ – that is Jews – and ‘them’ – Greeks and Egyptians.³⁹ The author of Second Maccabees also creates this distinction. In an authorial insertion mid-way through the work a direct comparison is drawn between God’s treatment of the Jews as opposed to His treatment of other nations: ‘With the *other* nations the Lord waits patiently ... Quite otherwise is his decree for *us*’

³⁶ See Smith M *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh* Vol. I ‘Studies in Ancient Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism’ Ed. by S.J.D. Cohen (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1966) I.263-4. Note also our findings regarding ἔθνος in Second Maccabees, see Chapter Six this thesis.

³⁷ *CIJ* No. 757; Schürer III.3; Cohen (1999) 1ff.

³⁸ E.g. Josephus draws a distinction between Jews [Ἰουδαῖοι] and foreigners [ἀλλόφυλοι] at *Antiquities* XX.262. For Rabbinic Literature see Stern S. *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings* Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums. No. 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1994) Chapter One and Cohen (1999) 1ff. Porton G.G. *Goyim: Gentiles and Israelites in Mishnah-Tosefta* Brown Judaic Studies No. 155 (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1988).

³⁹ Philo *Against Flaccus* 43: ‘He [the governor] knew that both the city and the whole of Egypt held two sorts of inhabitants, us and them ...’ [ἐπιστάμενος, ὅτι καὶ ἡ πόλις οἰκήτορας ἔχει διττούς, ἡμᾶς τε καὶ τούτους, καὶ πᾶσα Ἀἴγυπτος...].

(emphasis added).⁴⁰ Leaving the religious subject matter aside – for now – the bipolar terminology raises some interesting questions. Not least, who are these ‘others’ and what is our author’s opinion of them? Can we analyse the Jewish ‘other’ (the Gentiles) in Second Maccabees in a similar way to how we have used Herodotus’ *Histories* to identify and discuss the Greek ‘other’ (the Barbarians)? We know that we can, in this time period, interpret Ἰουδαῖοι in cultural terms. Furthermore, in examining these issues we should be able to comment on the relationships between the Jews and the other nations of the world. Therefore, any insights will provide identity boundary markers and may relate to the perennial question of Judaism’s integration or conflict with Hellenism. We must now turn our attention to analysis based on the book of Second Maccabees itself.

⁴⁰ II Macc. VI.12-17: ‘I beg those who happen upon my book not to be disheartened by the calamities but to consider that chastisements come not in order to destroy our race but rather to teach it. For if the ungodly are not left alone for long, but straightaway incur punishment, it is a sign of great goodness. With the other nations the Lord waits patiently, until he can punish them when they have attained the full measure of their sins. Quite otherwise is his decree for us, in order that He should not have to punish us later, when we have come to the complete measure of our sins. Thus, He never lets His mercy depart from us. Rather, in that He teaches us by calamity, He never deserts His people. Let this be enough as a reminder for you. Now we must quickly return to our story’ [Παρακαλῶ οὖν τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τῇδε τῇ βίβλῳ μὴ συστέλλεσθαι διὰ τὰς συμφοράς, λογίζεσθαι δὲ τὰς τιμωρίας μὴ πρὸς ὄλεθρον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς παιδείαν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν εἶναι. καὶ γὰρ τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἑᾶσθαι τοὺς δυσσεβοῦντας, ἀλλ’ εὐθέως περιπίπτειν ἐπιτίμοις, μεγάλης εὐεργεσίας σημεῖόν ἐστιν. οὐ γὰρ καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνων ἀναμένει μακροθυμῶν ὁ δεσπότης μέχρι τοῦ καταντήσαντας αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἐκπλήρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν κολάσαι, οὕτως καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν ἔκρινεν εἶναι· ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τέλος ἀφικομένων ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὕστερον ἡμᾶς ἐκδικῇ. διόπερ οὐδέποτε μὲν τὸν ἔλεον ἀφ’ ἡμῶν ἀφίστησιν· παιδεύων δὲ μετὰ συμφορᾶς οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαόν. πλὴν ἕως ὑπομνήσεως ταῦθ’ ὑμῖν εἰρήσθω· δι’ ὀλίγων δ’ ἐλευστέον ἐπὶ τὴν διήγησιν].

Part Two

Jew and Gentile

* * *

Chapter Three

‘Us’

In Second Maccabees

In the previous chapter we spent considerable time discussing the term Ἰουδαῖοι and demonstrating how its meaning evolved by noting, in particular, the growing importance of cultural attributes that became associated with the word. We can now begin a more focussed study and examine the specific use and meaning of Ἰουδαῖοι in Second Maccabees, including an analysis of the boundaries and relationships between Ἰουδαῖοι (us) and ‘others’ (them). This will also enable us to begin to make some comment on the perceptions and beliefs of Jewish Society at a point in time. To that end, a systematic search of Second Maccabees for the term Ἰουδαῖοι reveals that it appears, in its various forms, seventy-five times (listed as an Appendix).¹ Our first observation is that this number of references is in no way insignificant, something that will become more apparent when we have discussed other groups of people represented in the text of Second Maccabees.² Furthermore, this suggests that: First, we have more than enough entries to get a clear understanding of the meaning(s) our author associated with this term. Second, it is unashamedly a Jewish text that centers on the Jews/Judaeans.

¹ Cf. “Appendix One: Ἰουδαῖοι In Second Maccabees”. All references to Judas Maccabaeus have been omitted, as have those to ‘Hebrews’ [II Macc. VII.31; XI.13, XV.37] and ‘Jerusalem’ [II Macc. I.1, 10; III.6, 9, 37; IV.9; V.25; VI.2; VIII.31, 36; IX.4; X.15; XI.5, 8; XII.9, 29, 31, 43; XIV.23, 27; XV.30].

² The Ἕλληνες, for example, is a term used only Nine times - see Chapter Four, this thesis. See also the tabulated lists of the Surrounding Nations at Appendix Two (and discussion in Chapters Five and Six).

Judaea and Second Maccabees

We can begin our analysis with the eleven occasions that (a form of) Ἰουδαῖος refers to the country Judaea and not to the people.³ While this in itself could provide the basis to exclude them from our study (i.e. on the premise that a geographic location in itself does not necessarily equate to a ‘people’), a closer examination of these references is revealing. Consider the following passage:

ὁ δὲ ταχέως προχειρισάμενος Νικάνορα, τὸν τοῦ Πατρόκλου τῶν πρώτων φίλων, ἀπέστειλεν, ὑποτάξας πανφύλων ἔθνη οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν δισμυρίων, τὸ σύμπαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐξῆρται γένος·

He [Ptolemy] quickly appointed Nicanor son of Patroclus a member of the highest order of King’s friends and sent him in command of no fewer than twenty thousand soldiers of various nationalities to destroy all the people of Judaea.

[II Macc. VIII.9]

What makes this passage interesting is that our author chooses to clarify whom Nicanor was sent to destroy: ‘all the people of Judaea’ [τὸ πᾶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ... γένος]. At the risk of stating the obvious, if Ἰουδαῖοι means ‘Judeans’ or more literally ‘the people of Judaea’ our author could simply have used a form of Ἰουδαῖος instead of the lengthy, more descriptive phrase chosen. We can speculate *ad nauseam* about why our author did this, accept that it was a literary convention, or simply explain the phrase as an addition included for dramatic effect. Nevertheless, let us persist with our line of discussion a little further. It is possible that the phrase ‘all the people of Judaea’ was used to encompass the different peoples, regardless of their ethnic origins (lineage), who resided in Judaea. However, the subject matter of Second Maccabees and the context of the passage itself militates against this reading. Once the geography is clarified Nicanor’s victims are simply described as the Ἰουδαῖοι. Nicanor proposes to capture and sell the

³ Consider, for example, the beginning of Chapter XI [specifically II Macc. XI.5] which describes how Lysias ‘entered into’ or ‘invaded Judaea’ [εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν]. The other references are II Macc. I.1; I.10; V.11; VIII.9 (cited below); X.24; XIII.1, 13; XIV.12, 14; XV.22.

Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι) as a result of this invasion.⁴ No mention is made of any other nationality.

It is clear, therefore, that our author believes that Nicanor's aggression was directed towards the Jews living in Judaea. This would suggest that we should interpret this phrase as a clarification, one that recognises and compensates for the different political and social groupings in Judaea at the time: 'All the Jews of Judaea' is all encompassing, not targeting any particular Jewish faction. This interpretation is supported by similar descriptions used on other occasions in the text. In Chapter Fourteen we find the phrase 'all of our race' [II Macc. XIV.8] which seems to be referring to all the Jews everywhere regardless of social, cultural, and political persuasions. The same can be said about the stated desire of 'the entire Jewish nation' to celebrate the rededication of the Temple [II Macc. X.8] and Onias' prayer for the 'whole Jewish community' [II Macc. XV.12].

The different Jewish factions within Judaea is (in a sense) mirrored by the dispersed nature of Jewish society itself. Any Jew hearing this account may not have automatically associated a reference to attacking Ἰουδαῖοι with attacking Judaea: why would the use of the term Ἰουδαῖοι (in isolation) refer any more to the Jews of Jerusalem (or Judaea) than to the Jews of Alexandria? Clarification may have been needed. Moreover, this is not an isolated example. The pattern of juxtaposing the Ἰουδαῖοι and a geographic region is repeated elsewhere. In Chapter Ten we are informed how Timotheus had earlier suffered a defeat by the Ἰουδαῖοι so he marched against Judaea [II Macc.

⁴ II Macc VIII.10-11. See also II Macc VIII. 32 and 34.

X.24]. Other obvious examples are the two prefixed letters: the Jews of Jerusalem in Judaea send the letters to the Jews in Egypt.⁵

The reason for making this distinction is clear: the growing Diaspora. While it would not have been the intention, this identification (greeting) process, albeit subtly, recognises both the geographic link between Ἰουδαῖοι and Judaea (by legitimising a Jewish presence outside of Judaea); and confirms an increased interaction among different peoples. We have identified this as a factor attributing to an increased cultural association to the term Ἰουδαῖοι.⁶ There is also a clear distinction being drawn between the Jews of Judaea and those of Jerusalem. The segregation perhaps indicates the growth of Jerusalem as the equivalent of a Greek πόλις as well as (or) suggesting that Jerusalem had a different (superior) status. To be a Ἰουδαῖος from Jerusalem, for the author of this letter, was different from being a Ἰουδαῖος from Judaea – in itself perhaps a further indication of the uncertain geographic association with the term.⁷

We could explain these references (especially the introductory phrases to the letters) as a literary convention.⁸ However, even literary conventions can arise from societal developments and/or a need: in this case geographic (social?) clarification. What makes this interesting is that by accepting our interpretation we can clarify details in

⁵ II Macc. I.1-10; I.10-II.18. Certainly the passage could be translated as ‘the people of Judaea [residing] in Egypt’, but then why does the author need to clarify that the letter is from the Judeans in Jerusalem and Judaea? While these letters were probably not written by our author, any beliefs evident in them that compliment those in the main text support our inference that we are dealing with a wider societal issue.

⁶ An observation given support, inadvertently I suspect, by the translations and commentaries used in this study: each author uses ‘Jews’ when translating this passage.

⁷ Whether Jerusalem was a Greek πόλις or not is much debated (see Chapter Eight this thesis). It is clear that Jerusalem had a distinctive identity that is separate from Judaea’s (note also II Macc. X.14-15).

⁸ See e.g. Goldstein [(1983) 139ff] who is indecisive on the literary conventions in the first letter.

other passages. Consider, the description of Gorgias harassing the Jews in Chapter Ten and Judas' response:

Γοργίας δὲ γενόμενος στρατηγὸς τῶν τόπων, ἐξενοτρόφει, καὶ παρ' ἕκαστα πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπολεμοτρόφει. ὁμοῦ δὲ τούτων καὶ οἱ Ἰδουμαῖοι ἐγκρατεῖς ἐπικαίρων ὀχυρωμάτων ὄντες, ἐγύμναζον τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ...

Gorgias on becoming Governor of the territories hired mercenaries and in all ways sought hostilities against the Ἰουδαῖοι. At the same time the Idumaeans, who were in control of strategic fortresses, also harassed the Jews ...⁹

The geographic details in this passage are somewhat vague. Gorgias could have attacked the Jews in Judaea or in the territories around Judaea, before – as subsequent lines demonstrate – Judas responds with excursions against the Idumaeans.¹⁰ Determining exactly what occurred is dependent on interpreting Ἰουδαῖοι, especially since there is no direct reference to the territory of Judaea. If we follow our hypothesis (i.e. minimising the geographic component of Ἰουδαῖοι) it would appear that Gorgias harassed Jews in the lands around Judaea, perhaps wanting Judas to respond in order to provoke a war.¹¹ Importantly, there is further support for this interpretation. Consider how Gorgias is described as the 'governor of the territories', where 'the territories' are the less

⁹ II Macc. X.14-15. We should note that in the Codex Alexandrinus the text at this point [X.14] does not read Ἰουδαίους but ἰδίους. However, the context makes it clear that the Jews are meant here. Moreover, our text [Rahlfs' edition] has Ἰουδαίους so this is the reading we will accept. We have noted the variant reading simply because it relates to a key word in our discussion.

¹⁰ Goldstein notes (in a very general and sweeping comment) that Jason is vague on matters of geography. It is perhaps better to observe that our author (and/or Jason) was not as particular on geography (with regard this passage at least) as the author of First Maccabees (Cf. I Macc. V.3-5; Goldstein (1983) 389).

¹¹ It is true that II Macc. X.15 goes on to make reference to Jerusalem, but this is with regard to renegades who had fled Jerusalem and were now being harboured in the surrounding territories. The point was to antagonise Judas further and to promote war. The mention of Jerusalem in no way clarifies what Jews were the subject of the aggression by Gorgias and the Idumaeans.

favourable or underprivileged regions *around* Judaea.¹² Therefore, Gorgias' primary focus is probably with events outside of Judaea, so it is reasonable to assume that the hostilities described are also directed against the Jews in the territories (i.e. outside of Judaea).

This scenario is further strengthened by the parallel account of these events found in First Maccabees. In the opening passages of Chapter Five there is a description of how the gentiles living round and about desired to remove, kill and destroy those of 'Jacob's race' that *lived among them*. Consider the relevant lines from the text:

Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἤκουσαν τὰ ἔθνη κυκλόθεν ὅτι ᾠκοδομήθη τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἐνεκαινίσθη τὸ ἁγίασμα ὡς τὸ πρότερον, καὶ ὠργίσθησαν σφόδρα καὶ ἐβουλεύσαντο τοῦ ἄραι τὸ γένος Ἰακώβ τοὺς ὄντας ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤρξαντο τοῦ θανατοῦν ἐν τῷ λαῷ καὶ ἐξαίρειν.

“And it happened that when the peoples round about had heard that the Temple had been built and the Altar restored as before, they grew very angry. And they decided to wipe out Jacob's race living among them and they began to kill and exterminate among the people' [i.e. the Jews]’.¹³

The Greek here is clear: the hostilities were not, initially at any rate, directed against the Jews in Judaea but those Jews who dwelt amongst the gentiles – or more specifically among the peoples who lived in the lands around Judaea (the territories). Judging by the details in First Maccabees Chapter Four and Judas' subsequent actions in Chapter Five the Gentiles referred to are probably the Idumaeans, which supports the

¹² II Macc. X.14. In the Seleucid Empire 'the territories' can be interpreted as a label indicating unprivileged areas [Goldstein (1983) 389]. The Jews could have used this terminology to refer to (and undermine) the regions around Judaea. See discussion in Goldstein (1976) 195, (1983) 389 and references cited therein. Note that Josephus presents Gorgias as the commander of Jamnia [*Antiquities* XII.8.6 (351)], while at II Macc XII.32 he is the 'Governor of Idumaea'. Regardless of the exact title he held all accounts present him as a ranking Seleucid official associated with the territories around Judaea.

¹³ I Macc. V.1-2. Note the use of λαός here – see discussion a little later in this Chapter.

details provided in our cited passage from Second Maccabees.¹⁴ Furthermore, in the lines following those cited [i.e. I Macc. V.1-2] we learn that more gentile territories are threatening the Jews living among them (as opposed to the Jews in Judaea). The gentiles in Gilead, for example, attempt to destroy the Jews in their region [I Macc. V.9-13]; while those in Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon, and Galilee are reported to have mobilised armies for the destruction of the Jews in their respective territories [I Macc. V.14-15].¹⁵

Israel

There is a related topic that we must make mention of at this point. Our author uses other terms to refer to Judaea (Judaean/Jews), one of which is Ἰσραήλ.¹⁶ This term only appears five times in the text so our ability to make definitive observations is somewhat reduced.¹⁷ Nevertheless its appearance and use is interesting. The Lord either delivers Israel [II Macc.25]; is asked to deliver Israel [II Macc. XI.6]; gives Israel victory [II Macc. X.38]; is described as the God of Israel [II Macc. IX.5] or the people in Israel

¹⁴ In First Maccabees at the end of Chapter Four Judas fortifies Bethsura so that the Jews would have a fortress facing the Idumaeans [I Macc. IV.61]. In Chapter Five Judas attacks the Idumaeans [I Macc. V.3], then a few of the other nations living around Judaea – the Baeanites and the Ammonites [I Macc. V.3-6].

¹⁵ As an aside it is also interesting to note that when Judas and the Jews in Judaea gather together in response to these attacks, the question raised is not one of their self defence, but rather ‘what they shall do for their brothers who were in distress and under enemy attack’ [I Macc. V.16: τί ποιήσωσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν θλίψει καὶ πολεμουμένοις ὑπ’ αὐτῶν]. This could be interpreted as the excuse for aggression into the lands around Judaea, a way to justify territorial expansion.

¹⁶ ‘Israel’ is a term that underwent various transitions in meaning. Originally it referred to a sacral league of tribes; later when the monarchy was divided Israel was the northern kingdom opposing the Southern kingdom (Judah). After the exile it is (1) a term signifying God’s people (used especially by Jews when referring to themselves); (2) geographic region of God’s people (broadly Judaea). See Kittel G. [Ed.] *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* Translated (and Edited) from the German “*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*” by G.W. Bromiley (Michigan, 1967) III.356ff; Neusner (1996) I.322-4.

¹⁷ II Macc. I.25, 26; IX.5; X.38; XI.6. By contrast Ἰσραήλ appears 63 times in First Maccabees. See comments by Kittel (1965) III.360ff [I Macc.], 362ff [II Macc.].

are His [II Macc. I.26]. Israel is always used to designate the Lord's (promised) land or people, so there is a strong religious association. By comparison Judaea is not used in the same (theological) way so (mortal) kings/generals always invade Judaea or attack the Judaeans/Jews, never Israel. The meaning seems to transcend the physical geography by including an ideological (religious) element.

In terms of our identity analysis this sort of demarcation through different labels provides some indication of boundaries. Most obviously it confirms both the importance of religion and demonstrates that religion and Ἰουδαῖος are not interchangeable – Ἰσραήλ seems to represent a religious dimension of identity which Ἰουδαῖ- (be it Jews/Judaeans/Judaea) cannot. All references to Ἰσραήλ are in prayers or recognisable Biblical formulae [II Macc. IX.5] and are made by Jews referring to themselves (by comparison both Jews and foreigners can and do use the term Ἰουδαῖοι).¹⁸ Furthermore, the allusion to Israel as 'a (i.e. the Lord's) people' seems to be a way of referring to all the different factions of Jews that consider Judaea (Israel) home. Two points are evident from these observations: First, it provides further confirmation of a splintered Jewish society. Second, it supports the minimisation of the geographic component in Ἰουδαῖοι, another term (Ἰσραήλ) is used to express, or at least incorporates elements of, the religious-geographic ideal.¹⁹

¹⁸ See discussion on the use of Ἰσραήλ (and Ἰουδαῖοι) in both First Maccabees (as an illustration of usage in Palestinian Judaism) and Second Maccabees (as an example of usage in Hellenistic Judaism) in Kittel (1965) III.360-364.

¹⁹ Another important observation is that five references to 'Israel' are probably not from Jason's original text and may not be the work of our author. Two are in the probable interpolation in the second prefixed letter, while the other three are in parts of the text where authorial insertion (or later editorial alteration) seems likely – the account of Antiochus IV's demise, the end of Chapter X, the letters in Chapter XI, etc. This is not the place for such an analysis, but we should note that it could provide insight into the extant structure of Second Maccabees and even some insight into its relationship with First Maccabees.

Ἰουδαῖοι
And Second Maccabees

Leaving aside the eleven references to Judaea (and our discussion on both Israel and Judaea) we can continue our analysis by concentrating on the remaining sixty-four references to Ἰουδαῖοι. Now, four of these are to Ἰουδαϊσμός i.e. 'Judaism', a term that relates specifically to cultural practices and is derived from Ἰουδαῖοι.²⁰ This could suggest a further correlation between identity (Ἰουδαῖοι) and cultural, including religious, customs (Ἰουδαϊσμός). At the very least its presence in Second Maccabees is an indication of the way in which our author's understanding of identity is evolving. Nevertheless, as they are not used to identify a 'people' they too can be excluded at this point.

This leaves sixty occasions in Second Maccabees where a form of the term Ἰουδαῖος is used to label or categorise a group of people. How should we translate these references? We saw that Cohen has suggested that it is only on two occasions that Ἰουδαῖοι must mean 'Jews': II Macc. VI.6 and IX.17.²¹ The clear implication is that on all other occasions Ἰουδαῖοι should be translated as 'Judaean'. This assumption is, however, at odds with our demonstration (Chapter Two) that the cultural association implicit in the translation of Ἰουδαῖοι as 'Jews' began to emerge, or to at least increase in importance with regard to self identity, as early as the Persian period. Furthermore, a quick examination of Second Maccabees reveals that none of these sixty references *have*

²⁰ II Macc. II. 21; VIII.1; XIV.38 (twice). These are actually the earliest references to 'Judaism' and will be discussed later. See Goldstein (1983) 192.

²¹ See Cohen (1999) 91ff.

to be translated as 'Judaean'. This does not mean, of course, that on occasions 'Judaean' should not be preferred and used, consider the following passage:

Μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον Λυσίας ἐπίτροπος τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ συγγενῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, λίαν βαρέως φέρων ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγονόσι, συναθροίσας περὶ τὰς ὀκτὼ μυριάδας καὶ τὴν ἵππον ἅπασαν παρεγίνετο ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, λογιζόμενος τὴν μὲν πόλιν Ἑλλήσιν οἰκητήριον ποιήσῃν, τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν ἀργυρολόγητον, καθὼς τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἔθνων τεμένη, πρατὴν δὲ κατὰ ἔτος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ποιήσῃν.

Very shortly afterwards Lysias, the king's guardian and kinsman and regent, angry at the situation, mustered together about eighty thousand men and all the cavalry and marched against the Judaean/Jews. He intended to make their city a Greek settlement, to make their Temple pay taxes like the shrines of other nations and to auction the high priesthood each year.²²

Lysias is marching against the Jews/Judaean. The locality of the forthcoming conflict is made clear through reference to the Jews' city (Jerusalem) and the Temple. If we accept that the term Ἰουδαῖοι does still have some inherent geographical association – a point that we have stressed, even when minimising the connection in our earlier analysis²³ – then it should be clear that translating Ἰουδαῖοι as 'Judaean' better incorporates the geographic target of Lysias' aggression. Using 'Judaean' simply helps the reader understand the situation. Be that as it may, it is also interesting to note that our author still feels there is a requirement to insert other geographic markers: the city [II Macc. XI.2, 5], the Temple [II Macc. XI.3], and the region itself [II Macc. XI.5]. While

²² II Macc. XI.1-4. Jason's mistaken inference that this expedition occurred under the reign of Antiochus V not Antiochus IV does not affect our discussion at all; see Goldstein (1983) 402-404. On 'kinsman' in the Seleucid context see Goldstein (1976) 254, 422; (1983) 404. This is not an isolated example, see II Macc. IV.35 where Ἰουδαῖοι are compared to other ἔθνη, and II Macc. VIII.10-11 which follows a description of how Nicanor advanced against the whole population of Judaea. Note comments by Cohen (1999) 89ff – who, as we have noted, suggests virtually every reference to Ἰουδαῖοι should be translated as Judaean.

²³ Our analysis in the first part of this Chapter simply stresses that the geographic association is not as strong as perhaps it once was. No argument has been presented to suggest that it is no longer relevant.

the former two do add to the drama of the story, the later definitely (only) provides geographical clarification.²⁴

The fundamental point is that in this passage (or any of the others) is there a *requirement* that 'Judaean' be used nor would these passages lose a great deal in the translation if the term 'Jew' is used. Compare this observation with the conclusion we reached concerning Antiochus' promise that he would turn 'Jew' [II Macc. IX.17].²⁵ We determined that the possibility of Antiochus' becoming a Judaean with the strong ethnic and geographic connotation that this term incorporates was and is nonsensical. This is a far more definitive assessment than the one that we have just reached: The description of Lysias' opponents as 'Judaean' is only a slightly better translation than 'Jew'. Therefore, while we cannot ignore the fact that either Jew or Judaean could be used in most places throughout the text, we should tend toward using Jew.

This conclusion, in turn, demonstrates a shift in perceptions. First, while the geographic criterion is still a part of Jewish identity, it can no longer be automatically

²⁴ Moreover, a few lines later our author specifically states that Lysias' target was Judaea: 'Entering into Judaea he [Lysias] approached Bethsura, which was a fortified place about five *schoinoi* away from Jerusalem, he then besieged this place' [εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ συνεγγίας βεθσουράν, ὅντι μὲν ἐρυμνῷ χωρίῳ, Ἱεροσολύμων δὲ ἀπέχοντι ὥσει σχοίνους πέντε, τοῦτο ἔθλιβεν : II Macc. XI.5]. The *schoinos* was a Persian measure, much used in Egypt: see Goldstein (1983) 405.

²⁵ As discussed earlier, Cohen suggests that this passage is one of two in Second Maccabees that have to be translated as Jew. The second passage is found near the start of Chapter Six:

ἦν δ' οὔτε σαββατίζειν οὔτε πατρῶους ἑορτὰς διαφυλάττειν οὔτε ἀπλῶς Ἰουδαῖον ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι

It was impossible to observe the Sabbath, or to keep the ancestral festivals, or simply to confess to being a Jew. [II Macc. VI.6]

Clearly Cohen is correct in suggesting that 'Jew' is a far better translation than 'Judaean' for Ἰουδαῖος – 'Jew' helps incorporate the cultural/religious ideas being discussed. However, Cohen's suggestion [(1999) 91ff] that Ἰουδαῖος *has* to be translated as Jew is far less compelling than that made concerning Antiochus' promise [IX.17]. Certainly, 'Jew' is preferable; but 'Judaean' is acceptable (people may have wished to deny that they were 'from Judaea' so as to avoid official displeasure).

associated with the term Ἰουδαῖοι. The campaign against Gorgias as represented in both First and Second Maccabees directly illustrates this point and our preference of Jew over Judaeon in translating Ἰουδαῖοι reflects it. Second, culture – in the sense of customs, adherence to laws and different practices – is now of central importance. Second Maccabees seems to be providing evidence of how the interpretation of Ἰουδαῖοι was evolving. It does not mark the beginning of this evolution, but is a part of a process of change.

Λαός

We have already noted that our author uses several labels to refer to the Jews or discuss aspects of Jewish life.²⁶ One of these is particularly illuminating and requires a detailed examination in its own right. To begin consider two lines from a passage we cited in full earlier (that which demonstrated that our author divided the world's peoples into 'Us' and 'Them' [II Macc. VI.14-17]):

‘Διόπερ οὐδέποτε μὲν τὸν ἕλεον ἀφ’ ἡμῶν ἀφίστησιν· παιδεύων δὲ μετὰ συμφορὰς οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαόν’

‘... [God] never lets His mercy depart from us. Rather, though He teaches us by calamity, He never deserts His people ...’ [II Macc. VI. 16]

As an authorial insertion the details in these lines will not be (or not necessarily ‘just be’) a direct listing of historical facts or for that matter a repetition of Jason of Cyrene’s opinion, but rather a reflection of our author’s beliefs and perceptions. The words chosen, therefore, are of particular interest. With this in mind consider the last phrase – ‘... οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαόν...’ – and in particular the use of λαός.

²⁶ We mentioned ‘Israel’ above, although limited references to it and terms such as ‘Hebrews’ [II Macc. VII.31; XI.13, XV.37] mean (in these cases) definitive patterns (definitions) are unable to be established.

Now, with such a generic label [λαός translated as ‘people’] it is necessary to rely on the context of the passage to inform us ‘who’ the people are to whom the term refers. In this paragraph [II Macc. VI.14-17] it is clear that the ‘people’ referred to are God’s people. At the start of the passage [II Macc. VI.14] the Lord is directly referred to and even in the few lines we have cited they (the people / λαός) are described as ‘His people’ [τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαόν]. There can be no doubt, therefore, that in this passage λαός is referring to the Jews.

In isolation this one instance of λαός referring to the Jews tells us very little, but further insights can be gained by examining other references to λαός. A search of Second Maccabees reveals that λαός is used a total of eleven times; there are four instances in the two prefixed letters and seven in the main text. For ease of analysis these references are tabulated below:

**Λαός
In Second Maccabees²⁷**

No.	Ref.	Word	Translated As	Refers to	Rel. Context	Context Outline
1	I.26	λαοῦ	People	Jews	Yes	Part of a prayer to unite the people of Israel.
2	I.29	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	Request for the Lord to return His people to the Holy place.

²⁷ Both the main text of Second Maccabees and the attached letters are included in this table. As usual we have used the CD ROM: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (University of California, 1999) for searching.

The columns are self-explanatory, but to ensure clarification: ‘No.’ is Table entry Number; ‘Ref.’ is the relevant reference in Second Maccabees; ‘Word’ is the version of λαός found in the text; ‘Translated As’ is my translation of λαός at each reference; ‘Refers to’ further clarifies which people is meant by our author; ‘Rel. Context’ indicates whether or not the context in which λαός is used is religious; and finally ‘Context Outline’ provides more detail on each reference demonstrating the context in which λαός was used in more detail than the previous column gives.

3	II.7	λαοῦ	People	Jews	Yes	Indication that God would, some day, gather His people together again.
4	II.17	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	God delivered all His people ...
5	VI.16	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	The Lord will never forsake His people ...
6	VIII.2	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	Judas and his followers called upon the Lord to look upon His people ...
7	X.21	λαοῦ	People	Jews	? [Yes]	Judas called together the governors of the people. See Pp. 98 below.
8	XIII.11	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	The Lord will not let His people remain subject to the blasphemous nations.
9	XIV.15	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	The Jews made supplication to Him who had established His people forever.
10	XV.14	λαοῦ	People	Jews	Yes	In a vision the ex-High Priest Onias introduces the prophet Jeremiah who prayed much for the people.
11	XV.24	λαόν	People	Jews	Yes	Judas prays to the Lord asking Him to terrify those who come against the Holy people.

There are several observations we can make based on these tabulated references. First, every reference to λαός is best translated as ‘people’, which is perhaps not surprising as it is one of the basic meanings of the word.²⁸ Second, the context of each

²⁸ This ‘best translation’ is based on my own analysis of each of the passages cited. Λαός can also mean ‘men’, especially ‘soldiers of the army’ or ‘land army’; see, for example I Macc. V.42; XVI.6-7. In the Septuagint λαός normally means ‘people’ in the sense of a union or a related group, as opposed to an unspecified crowd or populace. In the New Testament it means ‘Jews’ as opposed to Gentiles, while later it

passage makes it clear that in every occasion the people referred to are the Jews, *λαός* is never used to describe the people of any other (non-Jewish) nation, race or grouping.²⁹ The significance of this observation is further enhanced when we realise that *λαός* consistently refers to the Jews in both the main text of Second Maccabees and the two attached letters at the front of the book. As we have discussed earlier these two letters were probably penned by a different author (or authors) from the main text, thereby suggesting the association between *λαός* and the Jews is not just a product of our author's perception, but is widely accepted.³⁰

Furthermore, this simple observation indicates that we may in fact be better advised to consider *λαός* as an ethnic marker. By using the term exclusively to refer to the Jewish people our author is drawing a clear distinction between them (i.e. the Jews) as a people and the other nations. In other words, the choice of language that our author makes confirms or re-confirms an 'us' and 'them' distinction. Our author and presumably his audience viewed the Jews as different, a unique group of people that they at least could identify.³¹

is understood to mean 'Christians' as opposed to 'Heathens' (in First Maccabees, *λαός* is sometimes used to refer to 'Jews' as opposed to 'Heathens/Gentiles'). My translation as 'people' is supported by all the translations of Second Maccabees I have used in researching this thesis; i.e. each translator has tended to use 'people' whenever *λαός* appears in the text.

²⁹ That *λαός* could be used for other nations or peoples is clear; see e.g. Pindar *Olympian Odes* VIII.3; *Pythian Odes* IV.153, IX.54; Sophocles *Philoctetes* 1243, *Oedipus Tyrannus* 144; etc.

³⁰ This is further supported by an analysis of *λαός* in First Maccabees, where in the sixty occurrences of *λαός* in all but three occasions (I Macc. I.41; II.66; V.6) the 'people' referred to are the Jews (although, to be fair, on at least three other occasions (I Macc. I.52; VI.24; VIII.6) the Jews referred to are apostate Jews). See also Schürer who notes that in Biblical Greek *λαός* is the main designation of the 'chosen people' [(1986) III.89-90].

³¹ In some respects this observation is not new. Other modern commentators have recognised that *λαός* may have an ethnic basis, especially with relation to texts in the New Testament and the Septuagint. It is with the latter text that we are most interested. We have already noted that *λαός* refers to a related group of people as opposed to an unspecified crowd or populace – hence, to some extent, we can consider *λαός* to

We can take this analysis one stage further. There is another pattern repeated by our author nearly every time he uses *λαός*: In all occasions (with one possible exception) *λαός* refers to 'God's people', the 'Lord's people' or 'His people'. There seems to be a religious context to *λαός* as well as an ethnic one.³² Now, a relationship between *λαός* and religion has been noted before in the Septuagint; but not to the same extent. In First Maccabees, for example, a religious context or association is the exception rather than the norm, occurring in only three percent of the references.³³ This suggests several points of interest to us: First, it confirms the different focus between First and Second Maccabees. The latter (Second Maccabees) seems to have a very strong overt religious component. Be that as it may, for us our observation simply reaffirms the need to interpret Second Maccabees in context whenever we try to identify our author's opinion(s) and/or to extrapolate from them to his audience. It also helps define the correct context.

Second, the relationship between *λαός* and religion is particularly interesting when considered in conjunction with our previous discussion of *Ἰουδαῖοι*. We have established that one of the criteria to define the *Ἰουδαῖοι* is religion, however we have

be synonymous with *ἔθνος*. Furthermore, *λαός* can refer to *any* nation or nations in the Septuagint; see e.g. Genesis XXIII.7 (Hittites); Nehemiah IX.30 (all the other nations of the earth); or Genesis XL.40, Exodus I.22, VII-IX (the Egyptians – with a further distinction incorporated between the people and the rulers of the land). A strong association between *λαός* and *Ἰσραήλ* has also been identified [Cf. Kittel (1967) IV.34ff]. In general it is clear that Hebrew 'am is translated as *λαός* (and goy as *ἔθνος*, see later study this thesis). For more on these issues see Rost L. 'Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk in A.T.'. In *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament* (Heidelberg, 1965). The study and results we have identified, which indicate a direct and unequivocal relationship between *λαός* and the Jews in Second Maccabees is apparently not duplicated elsewhere. At the very least, therefore, the use of a particular term to identify the Jews confirms a clear distinction for them as a people, and by implication a clear set of criteria for determining who belonged to their group.

³² The one exception is II Macc. X.21, which is discussed in some detail below.

³³ In First Maccabees only two of the sixty references to *λαός* have a religious association: I Macc. IV.31, 55. Furthermore, while a relationship between *λαός* and religion has been noted in the Septuagint before [Cf. Kittel (1967) 34 ff., esp. 35-37], a detailed study of this relationship with regard to Second Maccabees has not been carried out previously.

emphasised that despite the efforts of some scholars, it would be wrong to equate or make the two terms synonymous. The use of λαός in the way we have identified supports our argument, in that our author is emphasising the religious criterion of Jewishness by using a different term: Ἰουδαῖοι was clearly not specific enough. In other words, our author could be manipulating or placing an emphasis on a term (i.e. λαός) to construct – in our terminology – a boundary marker, namely religion. This in turn indicates that there is more to being Jews – whether or not they are identified by the term λαός and/or Ἰουδαῖοι – than religion.³⁴

This notwithstanding, there is one possible exception to our pattern that we must address. Consider the relevant passage which describes Judas Maccabaeus' reaction when he learns that Simon's men had accepted bribes and allowed the enemy to escape:

Προσαγγελλέντες δὲ τῷ Μακκαβαίῳ περὶ τοῦ γεγονότος, συναγαγὼν τοὺς ἡγουμένους τοῦ λαοῦ, κατηγόρησεν ὡς ἀργυρίου πέπρακάν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, τοὺς πολεμίους κατ' αὐτῶν ἀπολύσαντες.

These matters were brought to the attention of Maccabaeus. Assembling the leaders of the people [Army] he prosecuted those who had sold their brothers for money by letting their enemies escape to fight again.

[II Macc. X.21]

There is no immediately apparent religious connection to λαός in this passage. Let us, however, consider the phrase 'leaders of the people' in a little more detail. It clearly refers to a group of Jewish leaders, which it is generally assumed are members of the *Gerousia* or are military leaders. That notwithstanding, there is also no reason why

³⁴ At the risk of pointing out the obvious, this is demonstrated by the use of a separate term to identify the religious component of 'Jewishness': If Ἰουδαῖοι and religion were synonymous why introduce λαός? This is the same ideology that we suggested is evident in the use of Ἰσραήλ.

they could not be Priests or some form of religious leaders.³⁵ In the context of Second Maccabees in general and our author's use of *λαός* in particular, such an interpretation does not seem at all improbable. There is even some further support in that the story itself is a well known Biblical motif: The man who sells (betrays) his brothers.³⁶ So while the religious association here might be more subtle there is no reason categorically to dismiss it. Be that as it may, I do not wish to presuppose an exclusive religious meaning for *λαός*. Rather, we should still accept the primary definition of *λαός* as 'a people' and consider the religious association to be a boundary marker. In turn this is another reinforcement, if any is needed, of the complexities inherent in identity analysis.

* * *

We have determined that, like the Greeks, the Jews viewed themselves as distinctly different from the other peoples of the world, directly labelling 'others' as 'gentiles'. The apparent need of both the Greeks and the Jews to categorise or divide the world in this way seems to have been strengthened by their respective interaction with foreigners in vastly dispersed geographic locations. In turn this influenced the criteria used by both peoples in defining themselves and others: bloodlines and geography were superseded by elements that we can loosely define as 'cultural': i.e. customs and one's 'way of life' (including religious beliefs).³⁷ This does not mean that geographic and/or ethnic considerations were ignored. Societies are fluid and to define them through the

³⁵ See, for example, Goldstein who speculates whether they could be the council of elders (*Gerousia*), a new national body set up by Judas, or just military leaders (*λαός* frequently means just 'army' in Greek). Goldstein does not reach a conclusion [(1983) 390-91]. Note that if the leaders were part of a new 'national body', then there is no reason why that group could not be religious – Hengel, for one, believes that these 'leaders' were priests [(1974) I.25-6].

³⁶ E.g. Jacob tricks his brother Esau into selling his birthright [Genesis XXV.29-34]; or Joseph's brothers conspire against him, selling him to the Egyptians [Genesis XXXVIIff.].

³⁷ For simplicity we should also understand 'culture' to include 'politics' when it (culture) is discussed as a broad concept or in an all encompassing manner, as it is here.

application of rigid criteria with specific labels is restrictive and artificial: the term 'Jew', while predominantly culturally defined, contains a geographic meaning as well.

The complexities of our discussion are increased further when we consider that the Greeks and the Jews also came into contact with each other. This is particularly relevant when we try to identify Jewish boundaries: the Hellenistic culture is the identifiable 'other'. Our discussion also suggests that the boundaries of what constituted 'being a Jew' were being blurred or redefined. It was possible (regardless of how improbable) to the audience and author of Second Maccabees that Antiochus could, despite his clear Seleucid heritage, 'become a Jew' [II Macc. IX.17]. As part of this process it is reasonable to assume that the Jewish view of other nationalities would also have altered. From a Jewish perspective a 'Greek' need not be someone born in a precisely defined geographical area, rather 'Greek' could have a cultural meaning *to the observer*. This shift in understanding actually mirrors the changing meaning of Ἰουδαῖος. As the Jews were forced by circumstance to maintain their own identity through unique customs, this altered the way they viewed the world around them. Therefore, any Syrians (for example) visiting the gymnasium in their own city could be understood as 'Hellenised' and even, in some circumstances, be labelled by an observer as Greek.³⁸

This, in turn, has to be balanced by Jewish cultural practices legitimately changing through interaction with other people (especially the Hellenes). A Jew, it seems,

³⁸ So the Babylonians could call their king (who they knew was Babylonian) a Jew for dismissing traditional religious beliefs in favour of those followed by Daniel; *Bel and the Snake* 28. The reverse is also applicable: a Hellene viewing someone partake and adhere to Jewish customs and Law would probably consider that person to be a 'Jew'. See the discussion by Cohen (1999) 25-68 esp. 58ff, 68. Related to this discussion is that concerning Proselytes, see e.g. Collins (1982) 163ff; Gruen (1998) 94-95; McNight S. *A Light Among The Gentiles* (Minneapolis, 1991) *passim*; Schürer (1986) III. 150-176; Feldman L.H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1993) 288-341 (for references and overview, his arguments on 'missionary activity' are not relevant here); Cohen (1999) 156ff.

can adopt some Hellenic practices and still be called a Jew – our author wrote in Greek.³⁹ However, at some point a Jew moving in this direction and following the Hellenic lifestyle is deemed to have ‘crossed over’ and is rejected by his/her kin. Consider the negative comments in Second Maccabees concerning the actions of Simon in opposing Onias [II Macc. III.4ff, IV.1 ff.]; and the description of Jason (who made his fellow-Jews conform to a Greek way of life [II Macc. IV.7ff]) as wicked [II Macc. IV.13]. That this sort of alienation can occur confirms some sort of cultural conflict or the rejection of some sort of foreign customs/ideas.

So where does this discussion leave us? We have recognised that the underlying principle in studies such as ours is context, from which we can ascertain beliefs and practices that suggest societal boundaries – albeit from the perspective of our author and his audience. The text of Second Maccabees has begun to demonstrate a complex array of meanings regarding the idea of ‘Jewishness’. Not least, we have demonstrated through our author’s use of *λαός* (and possibly *Ἰσραήλ*) how the Jews did consider themselves a unique grouping and how religion was an important identity maker.⁴⁰ This analysis is, however, only the beginning. As we have seen through Greek Historiography the best insights into self-identity come through an analysis of the other, so it is in this direction that we will now turn our study.

³⁹ So we have the concept of Hellenistic Judaism, see Hengel (1974) *passim*. However, note comments by Feldman (1993), esp. 3-44. Millar (1978) 1-21. Cf. Chapter Eight this thesis.

⁴⁰ Albeit not the only identity marker, hence we do not have the reliance on *Ἰουδαῖοι*, but rather the use of a separate term (*λαός*).

Chapter Four

‘Ἑλληνες as the ‘Other’ in Second Maccabees

‘Ἑλληνες

We have seen that the Greek – Jewish dichotomy is central to much of the modern discussion on First and Second Maccabees. It should not surprise, therefore, that we will begin our study of the ‘other’ in Second Maccabees with the ‘Ἑλληνες, examining each representation of the term so that, in the first instance, we can continue our discussion of identity issues. As our analysis develops we will also address other related themes, in particular cultural conflict and the extent of Jewish Hellenisation. To that end, we will follow the same procedure that we used for our discussions on Ἰουδαῖοι and λαός respectively, and present a tabulated listing of all the references to the ‘Ἑλληνες (in the word’s various forms) that appear in Second Maccabees.

‘Ἑλληνες In Second Maccabees¹

Number	Reference	Word	Comment
1	IV.10	Ἑλληνικόν	Greek customs are introduced to the Jews through the High Priesthood, with the result that Jewish customs are not protected (II Macc. IV.11).
2	IV.13	Ἑλληνισμοῦ	The earliest use of the term ‘Hellenism’ in our extant sources. Our author implies that ‘Hellenism’ corrupts the

¹ Both the main text of Second Maccabees and the attached letters are included in this table. For our search we have used the CD ROM: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (University of California, 1999). The columns are self-explanatory, but to ensure clarification: ‘Number’ is Table entry Number; ‘Reference’ is the relevant reference in Second Maccabees; ‘Word’ is the version of ‘Ἑλληνες found in the text; ‘Comment’ provides some comments on the reference, with particular attention being given to the context in which ‘Ἑλληνες is used. The relevance of the details in each column will become clearer as our discussion proceeds.

(2)	(IV.13)		Jewish Priests. Considering what we know of Jewish identity this appears to set Greek customs (Hellenism) against Jewish customs (Judaism).
3	IV.15	Ἑλληνικὰς	A continuation of the theme at II Macc. IV.13 (above) with Jewish Priests ‘enjoying’ Greek customs.
4	IV.36	Ἑλλήνων	Greeks are stated to have sided with the Jews over the horrific murder of Onias. Clearly a literary ploy by our author for effect – <i>even</i> the Greeks found this crime abhorrent!
5	VI.8	Ἑλληνίδας	Greek and Jewish customs pitted against each other.
6	VI.9	Ἑλληνικὰ	Greek and Jewish customs pitted against each other.
7	XI.2	Ἑλλησιν	Lysias, the king’s kinsman, planned to make Jerusalem a settlement for ‘Gentiles’ – more literally Greeks, or, perhaps, followers of Greek customs.
8	XI.24	Ἑλληνικὰ	In a letter from Antiochus to Lysias concerning the Jewish people. The letter acknowledges that Greek and Jewish customs had been pitted against each other. The letter is accepted as authentic; see Goldstein (1983) 414ff.
9	XIII.2	Ἑλληνικὴν	This passage refers to the Greeks invading Judaea.

In light of all the attention that the Greeks and/or Hellenism receive in the secondary literature it is perhaps surprising that our search resulted in only nine references to the term Ἑλληνες – compare this with the seventy-five instances of Ἰουδαῖοι in the text. Therefore, without even looking the above table, our first observation must be that the limited number of references provides circumstantial support for scholars who have been seeking to play down the alleged conflict between Greek and

Jew, Hellenism and Judaism.² Initial appearances, however, can be deceiving. No analysis of each reference to 'Ἑλληνες (in its various forms) or the context and/or role that all these references (to Hellene or Hellenism) play in the text of Second Maccabees (or First Maccabees for that matter) has been undertaken.

The Basic Interpretation

Chapter Four: 10,13, and 15

We will begin our discussion with the first three tabulated entries all of which occur near the start of Chapter Four [II Macc. IV.10, 13, and 15]. As each reference is related they are all included in the following lengthy citation:

Μεταλλάξαντος δὲ τὸν βίον Σελεύκου καὶ παραλαβόντος τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀντιόχου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Ἐπιφανοῦς ὑπενόθευσεν Ἰάσων ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ονίου τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην· ἐπαγγειλάμενος τῷ βασιλεῖ δι' ἐντεύξεως ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἐξήκοντα πρὸς τοῖς τριακοσίοις, καὶ προσόδου τινὸς ἄλλης τάλαντα ὀγδοήκοντα. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ὑπισχνεῖτο καὶ ἕτερα διαγράφειν πεντήκοντα πρὸς τοῖς ἑκατόν, ἐὰν ἐπιχωρηθῇ διὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτοῦ γυμνάσιον καὶ ἐφηβεῖον αὐτῷ συστήσασθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγράψαι. ἐπινεύσαντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς κρατήσας, εὐθέως πρὸς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτήρα τοὺς ὁμοφύλους μετέστησε. καὶ τὰ κείμενα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις φιλάνθρωπα βασιλικά διὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ πατρὸς Εὐπολέμου, τοῦ ποιησαμένου τὴν πρεσβείαν ὑπὲρ φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, παρώσας, καὶ τὰς μὲν νομίμους καταλύων πολιτείας, παρανόμους ἐθισμοὺς ἐκαίνιζεν. ἀσμένως γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν γυμνάσιον καθίδρυσεν, καὶ τοὺς κρατίστους τῶν ἐφήβων ὑποτάσσαν ὑπὸ πέτασον ἤγαγεν. ἦν δ' οὕτως ἀκμή τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς καὶ οὐκ ἀρχιερέως Ἰάσωνος υπερβάλλουσαν ἀναγνείαν, ὥστε μηκέτι περὶ τὰς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λειτουργίας προθύμους εἶναι τοὺς ἱερεῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὲν νεῶ καταφρονούντες καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἀμελοῦντες ἔσπευδον μετέχειν τῆς ἐν παλαίστρῃ παρανόμου χορηγίας, μετὰ τὴν τοῦ δίσκου πρόσκλησιν, καὶ τὰς μὲν πατρώους τιμὰς ἐν οὐδενὶ τιθέμενοι, τὰς δὲ Ἑλληνικὰς δόξας καλλίστας ἡγούμενοι. ὧν καὶ χάριν περιέσχεν αὐτοὺς χαλεπὴ περίστασις, καὶ ὧν ἐξήλουν τὰς ἀγωγὰς καὶ καθ' ἅπαν ἤθελον ἐξομοιοῦσθαι, τούτους πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητὰς ἔσχον. ἀσεβεῖν γὰρ εἰς τοὺς θείους νόμους οὐ ῥάδιον, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα ὁ ἀκόλουθος καιρὸς δηλώσει.

² Gruen, for example, identifies and comments that there are only five references to Hellenism – or some equivalent thereof [II Macc. IV.10; IV.13; IV.15; VI.9; XI.24]. See Gruen (1998) 3-4. Furthermore, there are only Five references to any form of 'Ἑλληνες in First Maccabees [I Macc. I.1, 10; VI.2; VIII.9, 18].

When the life of Seleucus had ended and the kingdom was taken over by Antiochus called Epiphanes, Jason the brother of Onias used underhand means to become High Priest, promising to the king by means of a petition, 360 silver talents and 80 talents of other revenue. In addition to these amounts he [Jason] promised to raise another 150 [talents] if provision could be made so that through his own office he [Jason] could establish a gymnasium and an 'ephebeum', and that he [Jason] could register those who were *Antiochenes* in Jerusalem.

With the king having consented and Jason having taken the office [of High Priest] he straightaway changed his people's outward characteristics [i.e. 'way of life': χαρακτήρ] to Greek. And the royal privileges established for the Jews by John, the father of Eupolemus, who [later] carried out an embassy for friendship and alliance with the Romans, he [Jason] set aside; and he [Jason] cast aside the daily life practices [customs] that are based on the law [i.e. traditional way of life] and he [Jason] made new strange customs against the law. For he gladly established a gymnasium by the acropolis [citadel, Temple] / below the Temple mount itself and he made the most excellent of the young boys [lit. ephebes] submit to the broad Greek Hat. In this way a peak of Hellenism and a zenith of foreign ways [customs] was reached through the unsurpassed ungodliness and wickedness of that false High Priest Jason. As a result the priests were no longer willing to perform the religious duties of the altar, rather they treated the Temple with contempt and neglected their sacrifices; hurrying, after being summoned by the gong, to take part in the training in the wrestling school against the traditional laws / customs. They no longer placed value on ancestral customs, instead they were bestowing the noblest recognition on Hellenic honours. On account of these things terrible misfortune beset them, and the people whose way of life they admired and whom they wished to emulate in every way, became their enemies and punishers, since to profane against the laws of God is no light matter, but the time following these things will show this.³

The context of this passage is, in a very general sense, political manoeuvrings that were occurring amongst both the Jews and various Seleucid officials who had an interest in Judaea. There was a new king on the throne which also meant that there were new opportunities for advancement, an environment which Jason sought to exploit. The result

³ II Macc. IV.7-17. Several aspects of this passage are difficult to translate, see discussion in Abel (1949) 330-334; and Goldstein (1983) 216-232.

of this political posturing, in the opinion of our author (or at least the belief he was advocating and trying to promote), was the advancement of Hellenism at the expense of Judaism. This should be readily apparent, but to ensure clarity consider the second of the three noted references to 'Ἑλλήνες. What we have is a description of the societal changes allegedly occurring in Jerusalem. To describe these changes and to emphasise his point our author chooses to use (and perhaps even creates) the term 'Ἑλληνισμός (and when he does so, we are provided with the first extant reference to 'Hellenism' [II Macc. IV.13]). The ideas and concepts that 'Ἑλληνισμός conjures up are varied, but we can make several observations regarding its use here by our author. To begin, it is an example of our Greek speaking Jewish author using an Hellenic idiom for his own purposes. The specific parallel is to Greeks who collaborated with the Persians during the Persian wars. A deserter of the Hellenic cause, and correspondingly a supporter of the Median (or Persian) cause, was said to 'Medise'. Herodotus, for example, describes how Megabazos subdued those people of the Hellespont who were not loyal to the Median/Persian cause: i.e. he 'subdued those who did not medise'.⁴ Our author reverses the Greek expression placing it in the context of the world as understood by him, introducing a word with a corresponding, implied understanding of 'loyal to the Greek cause'.⁵

Furthermore, the content of the entire cited passage (see above) makes it indisputable that our author intended the term 'Hellenism' to refer to 'Greek Customs' or, perhaps more specifically to 'certain Greek Customs'. Consider the text surrounding the

⁴ See Hdt. IV.144: .. οὗτος δὲ ὢν τότε ὁ Μεγάβαζος στρατηγὸς λειφθεὶς ἐν τῇ χώρῃ 'Ἑλλησποντίων τοὺς μὴ μηδίζοντας κατεστρέφετο. Note also Hdt. VIII.30; Thuc. III.62; etc.

⁵ See Goldstein (1983) 230. When applied to Jews the association implicit in 'Ἑλληνισμός was clearly intended to be derogatory, yet the use of this term with its clear manipulation of the Greek language and Greek ideology demonstrates the ease with which our author could navigate in an Hellenic environment - an interesting contradiction: see Chapter Eight this thesis.

reference to Ἑλληνισμός as a whole. Our author describes how Jason, having secured the high priesthood, ‘at once attempted to make his fellow Jews conform to the Greek way of life’ [εὐθέως πρὸς τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα τοὺς ὁμοφύλους μετέστησε].⁶ Traditional Jewish practices are rejected, a gymnasium is built and Greek athletic competitions embraced – both institutions are not only symbolic of the Greek lifestyle but are integral to the establishment of an Hellenic community. Above all else, the Jewish priests are stated to have sought Hellenic honours and neglected their lawful duties. Therefore, from the perspective of our author we have changes to Jewish society that are represented by the adoption of Hellenic customs (thereby demonstrating loyalty to the Greek cause) and resulting in what he describes as a high-point of Hellenism. This may or may not be an accurate representation of what was occurring in Jewish society. Regardless this is how our author chooses to represent events: he clearly blames Hellenism or at least understands Hellenism to be a threat (on some level) to Judaism.

Based on the methodology advocated earlier the Greek customs mentioned are those that our author would find odd and which therefore can provide us an insight (or window!) into Jewish identity. To this end, our initial comment must be that our author is expressing concern about cultural/political issues – he complains about Jewish customs that are either being replaced or are at least being threatened by Greek practices. In doing so he reinforces the importance of culturally based criteria for identity categorisation, i.e. the erosion of Jewishness is set against the appearance and adoption of Hellenic customs (our author’s ‘peak of Hellenism’). Specifically, we are told that Jason cast aside the traditional ways of life based on the law (read ‘Torah’ or ‘ancestral practices/laws’ as the translation of πολιτεία) and introduced customs that were against the teachings of the

⁶ II Macc. IV.10. This is a freer translation emphasising the meaning of the line, a more literal translation is included in the full passage translated above. The adoption of Greek customs can imply both the rejection of traditional Jewish practices and a (perceived) demonstration of ‘loyalty to the Greek cause’.

Torah.⁷ Emphasis is placed on how the priests are lured away from their religious duties to partake in wrestling matches, presumably in the gymnasium [II Macc. IV.14], and to seek Hellenic honours [II Macc. IV.15]. Finally, Jason himself was clearly the instigator of these atrocities even though (regardless of the way he acquired the position) he was the High Priest and therefore responsible for the maintenance of (and adherence to) Jewish religious practices [II Macc. IV.8, 10].

These observations (again) provide us with a clear affirmation as to the importance of religion to Jewish society (Jewishness). Priests were expected to undertake certain roles in society – wrestling and seeking external honours were not only considered to be outside the scope of these societal duties, they were also seen as detracting from them. Our author states directly that *because of* Hellenic customs the priests neglected their duties, failed to perform sacrifices and treated the Temple with contempt.⁸ This also makes clear that in our author's opinion the role of the priest (Jewish society) was centred on the Temple, not the gymnasium (Greek society): Jewishness was suffering because of the presence of the foreign institutions. Whether or not such criticisms are justified, they were made by a sector of Jewish society. Therefore, for some Jews Hellenic customs were perceived as undermining some religious practices and, to

⁷ See II Macc. IV.11, 15. Defining πολιτεία is a separate subject in its own right. In short, the basic understanding for the Jews seems to relate to the constitution of Moses, the use of ancestral laws, adhering to the Torah, etc. See, for example Josephus *Antiquities* IV.8.4 (196); Bartlett J.R. *Jews in the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, London, New York; 1985) 161-2; Collins (1983) 102-3; Goldstein (1983) 229. Consider also Troiana, who suggests that Josephus 'seems to mean by "the laws regarding the πολιτεία," those laws which would permit the Jews, especially those in the Diaspora, to live respecting Mosaic legislation' [Troiana L. 'The Πολιτεία of Israel in the Graeco-Roman Age'. In Parente F. and Sievers J. [Eds.] *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period* (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1994) 11-22 (12)].

⁸ II Macc. IV.13-15 – see cited passage above, emphasis added.

some extent (considering the link we have demonstrated between culture/customs and identity), Jewishness.⁹

It is also true that our author also uses Hellenic customs to undermine the character of Jason: he is accused of extending his power (role) through the establishment of Greek institutions. This notwithstanding, character assassination may not have been the primary purpose, for a subtler point is also made: the desire for Hellenic customs degrades the position (status?) of High Priest – from the perspective, at least, of a pious Jew! Jason is the means by which this process was advanced, leaving the impression that the High Priesthood and the institution it is symbolising, in terms of traditional values, are not considered to be compatible with certain Greek customs.¹⁰

⁹ Our point is clear, yet most commentators tend to minimise any indication of religious interference in this passage. Schürer, for example, when commenting on Jason's appointment as High Priest notes that there is 'no mention of any interference with the Jewish religion' [Schürer (1973) I.148]. Schürer suggests that Antiochus does wage a war against Jewish religion, but that this does not start until much later – after his unsuccessful campaign in Egypt in 168 B.C.E. and when Menelaus is High Priest [see (1973) I.152]. Other commentators support Schürer's position. Tcherikover states 'Jason's reform did not affect traditional religious life' and a little later: 'Jason's reform was not a religious one' [(1959) 166-7]; although Tcherikover appears to change his mind on Pp. 193ff. To my mind, such interpretations ignore the wider context (and effect) of religious influence on different parts of Jewish society. What also seems to be obscured is a differentiation between the perceptions of our author (including his ideological viewpoint) and the reality of the era's social and political events. More supportive of our position is Hengel who acknowledges that religion was bound up with the cultural and political aspects of Jewish life and, therefore, the Greek customs introduced by Jason must have had serious consequences for the religious life of the Jews [(1974) 74].

¹⁰ In other words to a large extent Jason is stylised in a literary sense as the 'villain' and developed in order to demonstrate the problems associated with some Greek customs – or perhaps more precisely with the erosion of some traditional values. We should also make a comment here on the 300 silver drachmas High Priest Jason sends to Tyre as a sacrifice to Heracles [II Macc. IV.18-20]. This clearly undermines monotheism, which of course is a fundamental tenet of the Jewish Religion and our author (as expected) takes exception. It is another opportunity for Jason to be denigrated and (perhaps) for a comment to be subtly made on the expanding political power of the High Priest – especially since increasing priestly influence seems to be associated with Greek institutions. For more on the political power of priests see Schürer (1979) II.227-8; Alon G. 'On the History of the High Priesthood at the End of the Second Temple Period' In *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World* Translated from the Hebrew by Abrahams I. (Jerusalem, 1977) 48-77; Cody A. *A History of the Old Testament Priesthood* (Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome, 1969) 175-7. Hengel emphasises the political power that the Priests had even before the Maccabean

To that end our author mentions three customs that seem to be of particular concern: the establishment of a gymnasium, ephebic organisation and a class of citizens called the *Antiochenes*.¹¹ As a general observation we can confidently assert that these three institutions and social classifications were alien to traditional Jewish society. While this in itself may not be surprising, what is interesting is the effect these institutions could have had on the Jews and the way they lived. Consider, for example, the ephebia and the gymnasium. The introduction of these institutions must have altered the way Jewish men interacted, which in turn could have threatened elements of the traditional social hierarchy. Of course such changes would not have been detrimental to all of those involved. The High Priest's position was being strengthened, but this must have been at the expense of other rival groups or families. Hellenic influence (and support) was being utilised by one Jewish faction to gain a political advantage over its rivals. In some respects, therefore, this account simply demonstrates the changing face of politics in Second Century Judaea.¹²

period, although he notes how the power of the High Priest was restricted by the Ptolemies through an administrator to oversee finances (1974) 24f. For a comment on the Jews donating monies to other deities see Schürer (1973) I.149, esp. n. 29; the point here though is that the High Priest was undertaking this action – not exactly a promotion of the ideology of there being one true God! Perhaps the most important point for us, however, is that by including this description our author is reinforcing both the importance of religion and providing another indication of how a Jewish practice (religion) was being undermined by foreign (Hellenic) customs.

¹¹ II Macc. IV.9. That each was established is made clear by subsequent lines; see for example IV.12, 14, 19. We are, of course, referring back (again) to the passage from Chapter Four that we cited earlier.

¹² Schürer notes that the High Priest's political influence had been balanced by the Greek overlords and the Jewish *Gerousia* in the period after the exile [(1979) II.227]. The implication for us is that Jason (and subsequently Menelaus) courted the Greeks to gain support and influence which was used to undermine the power of the Jewish *Gerousia*. From what we have seen, he was successful. Of course some members of the *Gerousia* would have supported him, perhaps initially the pro-Seleucid Tobiads? The Tobiads did come to support Menelaus against Jason: note Josephus. *Antiquities*. XII.5.1 (239ff). See Goldstein 'The Tales of The Tobiads'. In J. Neusner [Ed.] *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith At Sixty* In Four Vols. (Brill: Leiden, 1975) III esp. 91, 105-6, 121-22; (1983) 226-7.

The most puzzling of all the 'customs' Jason introduces are the *Antiochenes*. This group has been the subject of much speculation and discussion, but they are perhaps best understood as a class of Seleucid (Hellenic) citizens (the *Antiochenes*) in Jerusalem.¹³ This suggests the establishment of a new social class, which would have had a further effect on power relationships and the way that Jewish society operated. Jason drew up a list/registered [ἀναγράφω] a special class of citizens (or at least a new social class), which means that selections were made: some Jews were included while others were excluded. This process creates an 'in' group and those left 'outside' (another example of 'us' and 'them'). Once again the result must have been social change: those registered gained power and prestige over the others.

Upon reflection, the comments that we have made demonstrate that the Ἕλληνες are used by our author to represent religious, social and political change. Hellenic customs are presented (and perceived) as a threat to Jewish society, they are used to explain and emphasise the erosion of Jewish traditions. To reiterate, we learn how Jason cast aside the daily routines based on the law and established new practices that were against the Law [II Macc. IV.11]; Priests, neglecting their duties (sacrifices), participated in wrestling; and they placed no value on ancestral laws or customs [II Macc. IV.14-15]. There can be no doubt, therefore, that our author is concerned about this degradation of Judaism, or perhaps even 'Jewishness' (at least from his perspective) and is advocating a defence of the traditional Jewish lifestyle.¹⁴

¹³ This is the usual interpretation, although a whole industry has been generated trying to understand these words; see e.g. Goldstein (1976) 110-22, (1983) 227; Tcherikover (1959) 161ff, 404-9; Schürer (1973) I.148; and our extensive discussion in Chapter Eight, this thesis.

¹⁴ So even Gruen, while minimising the conflict between Judaism and Hellenism, accepts that Judas could be seen as in some way defending Judaism [(1998) 4]. Of course, if Judaism has to be defended there must be a threat. Gruen suggests 'King's Policies' (but not Hellenism); however, very little space is devoted to the analysis. For us 'King's Policies' are a part of the Hellenisation process itself. Hengel supports our

We can balance these comments to some extent by acknowledging that our author's motive may well have had a political component. This notwithstanding, to be credible (or more specifically for our author's book and ideas to be acceptable), the 'threat' had to be a realistic concern for a sizeable portion of the population. Our study demonstrates that Hellenism is clearly and consistently labelled as that threat. Not only are the Greeks positioned as the other in the text, their institutions and customs are presented as directly undermining aspects of the traditional Jewish way of life. Regardless of the reality, therefore, Hellenism was perceived, identified and labelled as a force destroying Jewish beliefs and customs.

We can take this ideology of defence a stage further. Ethnic groups have been defined as being based on, among other criteria, a shared history, beliefs, and cultural practices. With this in mind, it is clear that the erosion of traditional values undermines the idea of shared history and breaks down both the idea and the possibility of recognising a distinct Jewish lifestyle. Therefore, when our author advocates the need to defend traditional values, what he is really highlighting is that Jewish identity itself was under threat. The use of 'Hellenes' by our author in this passage [II Macc. IV. 7-17] supports this conclusion as the term signifies change: be it to Jewish society (through highlighting difference and creating new power structures); and/or (most importantly for our author) encapsulating the threat to Jewish society, Judaism, and Jewishness. Therefore the Hellenes and things Hellenic are change markers (even if only literary), with our analysis demonstrating that this change was perceived as a threat.

position arguing that Jason's policies were a 'decisive change of course in the development of the Jewish temple state, an attempt to do away with five hundred years of Israelite and Jewish history' [(1974) 73].

The Remaining References

Our conclusions to this point have been based on only the first three references to Ἑλληνας in Second Maccabees. However, in all but two of the remaining six references the same underlying idea of a cultural conflict is presented: Ἑλληνας – in the sense of Hellenic customs – are set in opposition to traditional Jewish values. Consider the two references [II Macc. VI.8, 9] that are part of a detailed account of how Antiochus sent out an Athenian ‘to compel the Jews to depart from their ancestral laws and to cease living by the laws of God [ἀναγκάζειν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους μεταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων, καὶ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ νόμοις μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι]’.¹⁵ We then receive a detailed description of how the Temple was polluted [II Macc. VI.2, 4ff]; how no-one was allowed to observe the Sabbath or to keep the traditional festivals [II Macc. VI.6], but rather had to eat the entrails of sacrificial victims and celebrate the feast of Dionysus [II Macc. VI.7]. The compulsive nature of this situation for the Jews and the direct Greek association is then made clear:

ψήφισμα δὲ ἐξέπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀστυγείτονας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις, Πτολεμαίου ὑποθεμένου, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγωγὴν κατὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἄγειν καὶ σπλαγχνίζειν, τοὺς δὲ μὴ προαιρουμένους μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ κατασφάζειν.

A decree was published in the Greek cities at the instigation of the citizens of Ptolemais that they proceed against the Jews in the same way and compel them to eat the [pagan] sacrificial meat, and to kill those who do not choose to adopt the Greek way of life.
[II Macc. VI.8-9]

Our author is emphasising that Greek cities support the policies advocated by Antiochus [II Macc. VI.8] – that were, incidentally, introduced by an Athenian [II Macc. VI.1] – and he labels the customs being imposed as Hellenic [II Macc. VI.9]. Of course

¹⁵ II Macc. VI.1. This passage is cited and discussed in full in Chapter Six, this thesis (including translation problems).

not all the customs were actually Greek: Near Eastern practices abhorrent to the Jews (e.g. sacred prostitution [II Macc. VI.4]) are included – but, for whatever reason, our author labels them as part of a bundle of Hellenic based concerns! Furthermore, the consequences for those who ignore the decrees and continue the practice of circumcision is death [II Macc. VI.10], while those who observe the Sabbath are burnt alive [II Macc. VI.11]. There can be little doubt that this demonstrably positions certain Greek and Jewish practices against each other. Jews must forsake traditional beliefs, embrace the ‘Hellenic’ way of doing things or suffer the consequences.

The next reference to ‘Ἕλληνας is at the start of Chapter Eleven. Lysias musters a large force to invade Judaea ‘desiring to make the city [Jerusalem] a home for Greeks [λογιζόμενος τὴν μὲν πόλιν Ἕλλησιν οἰκητήριον ποιήσιν]’. We are then told that he will implement foreign customs in the city; specifically, that the Temple will be taxed and the High Priesthood put up for auction [II Macc. XI.3]. The possibility of bidding for Priestly office is probably included in order to recall the activities of Jason and Menelaus, both of whom bought their positions and then instigated pro-Antiochian (Hellenic) policies.¹⁶ As for the taxing of the Temple, in reality this will have little to do with Hellenic practices/customs and more to do with the cash-flow problems of the Seleucids.¹⁷ Regardless, nobody likes new taxes. Therefore, what our author has done is

¹⁶ See II Macc. IV.1ff [II Macc. IV.7-9 (Jason), 23-25 (Menelaus)]. The sale of Priestly Office was not uncommon in Hellenistic kingdoms: See Goldstein (1983) 404-5.

¹⁷ The need for extra cash by powerful individuals or States has seen Temples raided for revenue throughout the ages. An extreme example could be the use of the deposits at Delphi by the Phocians [see: Diodorus XVI.23; Bury J.B. and Meiggs R. *A History of Greece: To the Death of Alexander The Great* Fourth Ed. (London, 1975) 420-30]. However, Goldstein’s assertion that this is ‘a standard custom’ is questionable [Goldstein (1983) 404]. What seems more likely is that it became standard practice for the Seleucids to raid Temples for revenue as their needs increased, especially after the defeat of Antiochus III at Apamea. See Johnson (2004) 15 esp. n. 29. The only evidence we have for the taxation of Temples at this time are the Maccabaeen sources [I Macc. X.29-30; XI.34; II Macc. XI.3], although in Roman Asia Minor taxation of temples apparently occurred: see Rostovtzeff (1941) 467, 506, 1440, n. 282.

alleged that Jerusalem's enemies are the 'Ἑλλήνες, that Jerusalem will be made a Greek city, and that this will result in foreign (understand, Hellenic) customs being imposed. Two customs that would be unpopular to any group of people are then described. The point is that by association these customs are intended to be understood as Hellenic and by implication contrary to traditional Jewish practices. The reality of the customs' origins, whether they are or are not Hellenic or if there are precedents in Jewish history, becomes irrelevant. Hellenism is condemned through association: it is once the city is Greek that taxes will be introduced.

This sort of indirect condemnation of the Greeks is further developed by our author in another, albeit related way. Through a process of subtle cross-referencing between passages layers of arguments are developed that help a reader blame Hellenism for the problems being faced by Judaism. Consider, for example, the above assertion that Jerusalem was becoming a Greek city and that foreign customs were being imposed. The later part of this accusation can be interpreted as referring to, or at least associating events here, with other passages in the text where foreign customs are condemned: In particular, I would suggest II Macc. IV.7-17 and VI.1-8. As we have seen in both these passages our author condemned the erosion of Jewish practices and blamed (directly and indirectly) the Hellenes. This sort of cross-referencing would further reinforce the negative perception of Hellenism.

This hypothesis is not just idle supposition. Consider the letter from King Antiochus V to Lysias where direct reference is made to how the Jews appeared unwilling to submit to Antiochus IV's policy and adopt Greek [Ἑλληνικά] ways:

ἀκηκοότες τοὺς Ἰουδαίους μὴ συνευδοκοῦντας τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικά μεταθέσει, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀγωγὴν αἰρετίζοντας ἀξιοῦν συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ νόμιμα

‘We have heard that the Jews do not desire to consent to the policies of my father [Antiochus IV] to change to Greek ways, but they are electing to follow their own customs and requesting to defer to their own laws.’ [II Macc. XI.24]

Our author here refers directly to a conflict between the Jews (and the inherent cultural practices we have associated with the term Ἰουδαῖοι) and ‘Greek ways’ (Ἑλληνικά or perhaps even Ἑλληνισμός? But undoubtedly Hellenic customs and practices).¹⁸ Therefore, once more we are presented with a clear juxtapositioning of Hellenic and Jewish ways. Furthermore, the letter confirms the link between Antiochus IV’s policies [II Macc. VI.1-9] and Hellenism. In turn this also demonstrates the sort of internal cross referencing we have suggested is integral to the text.

It is also interesting that this negative reference to Hellenism (and very direct comparison with Judaism, is presented in a letter). It is, theoretically, external to the text itself thereby acquiring the extra authority of being an independent source. Of course we can argue *ad nauseam* about the authenticity of the letter (which as an aside is generally accepted¹⁹), but to a large degree this does not concern our present discussion. The letter provides verification that the changes the Seleucid hierarchy had tried to implement (be it as a result of a request made by some Jews or otherwise) could be generically labelled

¹⁸ Gruen even includes this reference as one of the five occasions our author uses the term ‘Hellenism’, leaving no doubt that he considers the use of Ἑλληνικά here to mean (in a broad sense) Greek ‘customs/practices’ [(1998) 3-4].

¹⁹ The letter is accepted as genuine; see Goldstein (1983) 414ff; although Goldstein does not interpret the letter in the same way we are with regard to conforming to Greek customs. See Goldstein (1983) 416ff; (1976) 140-57. For more on the authenticity see Grabbe (1992) 262; Habicht (1976) 12; Momigliano believes it is suspect, arguing that there is no reason for it to have been sent to the Jews [(1975a) 84-5]. However, there is no date or valediction indicating that this letter is a ‘second copy’, i.e. meant for someone other than Lysias. It is doubtful that a forger would know Seleucid practise that well. Furthermore, we must remember that Antiochus V is 9 years old at this time and that Lysias is dictating the letter to him; i.e. (technically) writing a letter to himself.

'Hellenic' and were indisputably hostile toward traditional Jewish customs. The letter reinforces a perception advocated by our author and his supporters.

Finally, we can place all the above observations into the context of our identity discussion. The Greeks are used by our author to represent customs that are abnormal, they are portrayed as the other of Jewishness. Applying the relevant methodology (as introduced earlier) it quickly becomes apparent that there is one particular issue (aspect of Jewishness) that the 'Ἕλληνες / Ἑλληνισμός are constantly set against: religion. Recall that in Chapter Six we are provided with a detailed description of how the Temple was defiled and Jewish religious practices outlawed under the pain of death [II Macc. VI.1ff]; while Chapter Eleven describes the specific consequences of Lysias' invasion as interfering with the way the Temple is governed [II Macc. XI.3]. Chapter Four was even more direct, criticising the priests – and the High priest in particular) for neglecting their duties and adopting Hellenic customs [II Macc. IV. 7-17].²⁰ These points are not mentioned to exaggerate the role of religion in Jewishness, but rather to demonstrate our theory in practice and thereby to highlight how our author is particularly concerned with the religious traditions inherent in Jewish society.

The Exceptions

We have labelled two of our references 'exceptions' on the basis that they do not immediately seem to conform to our analysis. However, neither of these references undermine our observations: In both instances the 'Ἕλληνες are mentioned in very specific contexts. Let us consider each reference in turn.

²⁰ The last reference discussed [II Macc. XI.24] does not specify religion, unless we interpret 'observe their own laws' as following the Torah – see discussion on II Macc. IV.10, 13, 15 (above).

The first ‘exception’ is best introduced as a literary construction used by our author to emphasise a point.²¹ We are informed that the murder of Onias was a wicked deed that horrified the Jews. The extent of Jewish indignation is made clear in a description that emphasises how *even* the Greeks condemned the murder. This apparent sympathy has tended to be misinterpreted as demonstrating friendly relations between the Greeks and the Jews.²² The confusion is established by reading the lines in isolation and out of context. All of our analysis to date militates against the likelihood of our author saying something positive about the Greeks here: he has, after all, not long finished condemning Jason for introducing Hellenic practices and Antiochus for supporting him [II Macc. IV. 7-20]! The key to understanding the actual meaning of the phrase is in the use of καὶ as ‘even’ and applying the context we have outlined. The result is that the Greeks are being used as a literary tool, our author is using exaggeration to reinforce a point: ‘even those godless murderous Greeks who have caused us so much pain and suffering, who themselves have killed so many of our people, even they thought that this particular murder of that most upstanding Onias was callous and unjust’.

This reading could be dismissed as convenient speculation, however this is not the only time that our author uses this rhetorical figure. A little later in the same chapter we are informed of how Menelaus had instigated plunder, sacrilege and a riot in Jerusalem [II Macc. IV.39-42]. The king after listening to the charges as laid out by three representatives of the Jewish γερουσία (senate) acquits Menelaus (primarily owing to the interference of Ptolemaeus) and condemns to death his accusers [II Macc. IV.43-50]. These are men, we are so eloquently informed, who would have been acquitted *even* by those most uncivilised of peoples, the Scythians [II Macc. IV.47]. Our author is again

²¹ II Macc. IV.36 (and surrounding passages).

²² Cf. Goldstein (1983) 241.

using support from an unlikely group (in this case the Scythians, previously the Greeks) in order to emphasise a point: his disgust at the execution of three Jews (and, perhaps, the inequity of Seleucid – understand Hellenic – justice). From these two examples we can identify the basic (underlying) formula: an observation is made by our author, which is then linked by καὶ ('even') to a scenario that the intended audience would find unexpected (the Greeks support the Jews, the Scythians would impose fair justice). The second part of the construction adds drama, emphasising the events already described.²³

There is another dimension to this literary construction, the mentioned misinterpretation of these passages as indicative of a positive relationship between Jews and foreigners (in particular Greeks). Consider how the early Seleucid kings (especially Seleucus IV) were supportive of the Jews, even paying for Temple celebrations during the time Onias was High Priest [II Macc. III. 2-3].²⁴ This passage praises Onias, not because he fostered a positive relationship with the Seleucids, but because *even* the Seleucid kings respected the Temple. The distinction is subtle but informative: everyone knew what the Seleucid kings were really like (consider Seleucus IV's instructions and Heliodorus' actions in the following lines [II Macc. III.7-40]). Onias' 'greatness' is emphasised through the suggestion that even those blasphemous gentile kings could have supported the Temple. Contemplate also Antiochus IV's death-bed promise that he would 'even turn Jew' [II Macc. IX.17]. This is a passage full of literary constructions and interpretations – in this case the improbability (and insincerity) of Antiochus' new policy is reinforced by the most unlikely conversion. Our author is simply manipulating the

²³ Be that as it may, it is also important to note that the exaggerated events are still possible – just not very probable! That is what makes the construction so effective.

²⁴ See e.g. Johnson who makes much of the 'supportive' actions of the Seleucid kings and Seleucus IV at the start of Chapter III [(2004) 38-39], and Goldstein (1983) 200-201.

language to emphasise the points that he wants us to take notice of, a recognition that suggests that the traditional reading of these passages needs to be reassessed.²⁵

The second exception is the invasion of Judaea by Antiochus Eupator in 163 B.C.E. The king brings an army with him that our author labels as ‘Hellenic’:

Τῷ δὲ ἐνάτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ ἔτει προσέπεσεν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν Ἀντίοχον τὸν Εὐπάτορα παραγενέσθαι σὺν πλήθεσιν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Λυσίαν τὸν ἐπίτροπον καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἕκαστον ἔχοντα δύναμιν Ἑλληνικὴν πεζῶν μυριάδας ἑνδεκα καὶ ἱππέων πεντακισχιλίους τριακοσίους καὶ ἐλέφαντας εἴκοσι δύο, ἄρματα δὲ δρεπανηφόρα τριακόσια.

In the year 149 Judas and the men with him were informed that Antiochus Eupator together with a large force was advancing against Judaea, and with him was Lysias his guardian and chief minister. Each had a Greek force consisting of one hundred and ten thousand infantry, five thousand three hundred cavalry, twenty-two elephants, and three hundred scythed chariots.²⁶

There is clearly no association with customs or (in particular) religion in this account. However, the Hellenes are certainly viewed in a negative way with the term ‘Ἕλληνες used in a descriptive sense to refer to the invading army. If nothing else this again confirms our author’s view of the Hellenes. It is also worthwhile taking a closer look at the description of this army. Certainly in some respects the label of ‘Hellenic’ is not unexpected: Seleucid dynasties (if not their armies) are called Hellenic by other near

²⁵ There are other examples such as II Macc. IV. 18-20 [people of Tyre]; XIV.24 [Nicanor]. It is also interesting that no examples of this construction appear in the two attached letters, thereby indicating that we have a literary technique probably developed by our author (or possibly Jason).

²⁶ II Macc. XIII.1-2. Note also that: First, the Seleucid year 149 equates to 163 B.C.E. Second, the phrase ‘each had a force’ while literally correct does not make sense in context as Antiochus would only have been nine years old. The force would have been under Lysias’ command. Fortunately the exact meaning of this phrase in itself does not influence our argument. For comments on both see Goldstein (1983) 458-9.

contemporary authors.²⁷ Be that as it may, it is the social implications behind the creation of such labels that interest us, its development and use can reflect underlying perceptions. Consider the description of the army given: We are told it consists of one hundred and ten thousand infantry, five thousand three hundred cavalry, twenty-two elephants and three hundred chariots. The interesting point is the clear composite nature of the force (in terms of the ethnic mixture of peoples, not to mention twenty-two elephants). The infantry is simply too numerous to be solely comprised of Macedonians or Greeks, while any elephant units (for example) must be from India (probably as gifts from Indian princes).²⁸ The labelling of such armies as Greek [δύναμιν Ἑλληνικὴν] reinforces the idea that the term 'Hellene' can be considered a generic label – an observation that supports and is supported by our earlier discussion on both Ἕλληνες and Ἰουδαῖοι. On the basis of this criterion alone, therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that, for the Jews, those surrounding nations that supported Greek policy (at least to the extent that they would

²⁷ See, e.g. I Macc. I.1, 10: Alexander was the first to rule the *Hellenic Empire* Antiochus came to lead; see comments by Goldstein (1976) 191-3.

²⁸ E.g. Polybius V.79; XI.34; Livy XXXVII.40-41. It was probably during one of Megasthenes' trips to India that Seleucus received five hundred elephants from, according to Plutarch, Sandrocottus – that is Chadragupta ruler of the Mauryan empire: See Plutarch *Alexander* LXII.2; on Megasthenes and the relationship between the Seleucids and Indians see esp. Sherwin-White S. and Kuhrt A. *From Samarkhand to Sardis* (London, 1993) 91-103. For modern discussions of Seleucid military see Musti D. 'Syria and the East'. In F.W. Walbank et al. [eds.] *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Hellenistic World* Vol. VII Part 1 Second Ed. (Cambridge, London, New York; 1984) 175-220 esp. 190; Barchova (1976) esp. Pp. 42-53; and (1989) esp. Pp. 90-105; Sherwin-White et. al (1993) 53-9, 212-14. If further confirmation of the diverse background of the soldiers in this army [II Macc. XIII.1-2] is needed, then consider Josephus who makes it clear that the army was made up of mercenaries and all those of military age in Antiochus' kingdom [*Antiquities* XII.9.3 (366)]. The author of First Maccabees describes how Antiochus sought mercenaries from overseas and from other kingdoms [I Macc. VI.28-29]. Note also our author's description of the Seleucid army as παμφύλων ἔθνη at II Macc. VIII.9, cf. VIII.16: Our author was clearly aware of the composite nature of the force he labels 'Hellenic'. Moreover, this labelling again demonstrates our author's ability to reverse a Greek idiom: Diodorus, for example, labels Darius' army as Persian (despite its ethnic mix); see, e.g. the Battle of Gaugamela Diod. XVII.58-62 (note also XVII.58.1 which demonstrates that Darius' army was comprised of various peoples).

invade Judaea) were all seen as one group. In order to classify or categorise this group, the Jews gave a single identity marker/label (i.e. 'Hellene').²⁹

We cannot, of course, make a definitive statement as to the validity of such a broad Hellenic categorisation based on this one example since there are more than societal perceptions to consider when contemplating generic labels. Regardless, it does suggest that we should take particular care when determining and discussing exactly who the opponents of Judas Maccabaeus were (or could have been). It is to this question that we will turn our attention to next. Before we do, however, let us make some concluding observations with regard to the use of 'Ελληνες in Second Maccabees. First, within the parameters of 'identity' we have managed to confirm the central role of cultural practices; specifically, the importance of religion and traditional laws to 'Jewishness'. Our author takes particular care to emphasise that the pro-Hellenic policies of Jason and Menelaus resulted in the introduction of practices that he considered odd: exercising in a gymnasium, ephebic education and a new political class (the *Antiochenes*). The principal concern is how these new practices eroded traditional values by undermining established roles, changing the political landscape and, most importantly it seems, undervaluing Jewish religion and traditional law.

While these observations are interesting, they are relatively straightforward – for the most part explicitly stated in the text. Yet the analytical process that we have

²⁹ In the context of Jewish tradition such an approach is even more understandable. In Exodus, for example, instructions are given to the Jews from the Lord indicating that they can accept foreigners who, along with their family, adopt Jewish customs (in particular circumcision; i.e. follow the covenant of the Lord) where upon they should be treated 'as original inhabitants of their land [i.e. Israel]' and that there should be one law for the converted foreigner and the Jews [Exodus XII.48-49]. The underlying principle here equates to that which we are suggesting the Jews might have applied to non-Greeks adopting Hellenic ways: adopt the customs and way of life and join "them". See also Judith XIV.10; Josephus *Vita* 113 with 149; *B.J.* VII.45; Cassuto U. *A Commentary on the Book Of Exodus* Translated from the Hebrew by I. Abrahams (Jerusalem, 1967) 149-150; Childs B.S. *Exodus: A Commentary* Old Testament Library (London, 1974) 201-2; Cohen S.D. 'Respect for Judaism by Gentiles in the Writings of Josephus'. In *HTR* 80 (1987) 409-430; Cohen (1999) 140-174.

undertaken has opened up further insights in regard to the relationship between Hellenism and Judaism, Greek and Jew. In particular we are beginning to understand how our author perceived the Greeks and their role in his society. Furthermore, it is clear that the way the Hellenes are represented, cross-referenced, and used in the text demonstrates that their role is far more complex than the meagre eleven entries to 'Ἕλληνες suggest.

Chapter Five

The ‘Other’ Nations and Second Maccabees

In recent times modern commentators’ have begun to emphasise how Judas was not opposed by the ‘Hellenes’ but by the ‘surrounding nations’ [τὰ ἔθνη τὰ κύκλῳ]¹, or ‘the peoples of a different race’ [ἄλλοφύλοι or ἄλλογενεῖς].² While appealing, this is an hypothesis that seems to be based on a few key phrases from (primarily) First Maccabees and supplemented by selective parts of Second Maccabees.³ The reality is that little work has been done on what either text actually presents, by which I mean no specific analysis identifies who these surrounding nations were, how these peoples are represented in the texts, what the Jewish attitude towards them was and if examination of them can tell us anything about the Jews themselves or even the Jews’ relationship with foreigners (including the Greeks). This sort of study is necessary to provide a context in which to understand the above phrases.

With these observations in mind we will undertake such an analysis of Second Maccabees and consider the specific place names and different groups of people

¹ I Macc. III.25; V.1; V.10; V.38; V.57; XII.53. See also Josephus *Antiquities* XII.327; XII.330; and Gruen (1998) 5.

² I Macc. III.36; III.45; IV.26; X.12; XI.68; XI.74. See also Josephus *Antiquities* XII.336; XII.340; XII.241. In First Maccabees the one specified usage of ἄλλοφύλοι denotes the citizens of Galilee (i.e. not the Greeks), when describing their mobilisation for the destruction of the Jews [I Macc. V.15]. Gruen uses this passage to demonstrate that the ‘Greeks are not singled out’, and that ‘the issue of Hellenism takes a decided back seat’: See Gruen (1998) 6. Our later discussion will demonstrate that Hellenic influences cannot be dismissed that easily.

³ This is not intended to mean that Second Maccabees is ignored, rather to emphasise how it is made to fit the framework of First Maccabees see (e.g.) Gruen (1998) 1-40, esp. 3ff and note the prevalence of references to First Maccabees (esp. on Pp. 5 n. 10 and 11), also note the comments Gruen makes on Pp. 8 and references cited at n. 25, 26.

mentioned that we could classify as 'other'. By definition this will exclude any references to Jews, Hebrews, Jerusalem, etc, while to help expedite matters we will also exclude broad references to 'the enemy', 'Nicanor's Forces', etc. The role of these groups is for the most part self explanatory; after all Second Maccabees does recount a rebellion.⁴ I do not mean to suggest, however, that generic labels are not important, and we will discuss one [ἔθνος] in some detail; what we want to clarify first is exactly who the surrounding nations are and in so doing to gain an idea as to their respective role(s) in the text.

The Surrounding Nations

An examination of Second Maccabees reveals a total of 104 place-names or references to different groups of people.⁵ Clearly this is not an insignificant number. However, in fifty-eight of these references the relevant city or group is mentioned in a purely descriptive way; i.e. our author lists the area that a particular dignitary governs, or mentions a region that an army passes through, etc.⁶ These passages tell us very little about our author's attitude towards foreign peoples or about each group's role in the conflict, so our study will focus on the remaining forty-six references. There is one general observation that we should also consider: our total list of references involves

⁴ In short 'the enemy' are viewed negatively while Maccabaeus' men are seen in a positive light. Examples are numerous, but consider as illustrative II Macc. VIII.21 ff. ['Maccabaeus' men'], VIII.24, 25, 27 [Nicanor's men – 'the enemy']; VIII.30 ['Forces of Timotheus/Bacchides', note 'the enemy' VIII.31]; etc.

⁵ A complete list is attached as Appendix Two.

⁶ Examples of this are numerous, but consider the following references which are illustrative of what is meant: Jason of Cyrene [II Macc. II.19]; 'Apollonius son of Thrasaeus then governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia' [II Macc. III.5]; 'Heliodorus set off at once, ostensibly to make a tour of the cities of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia [II Macc. III.8]; '... And he [the king] set out from Egypt in a savage mood ...' [II Macc. V.11]; etc. These fifty-eight references do not include the 'tending toward positive' or 'tending toward negative' entries: Cf. Appendix Two, Table One.

extensive repetition with Egypt, for example, appearing seven times.⁷ Adjusting our Table to account for all such repetitions reveals that there are actually only fifty-four different peoples and places in the text.⁸

From these initial figures we can ascertain an initial impression as to the prominence of the surrounding nations in the text by classifying how many places are 'local' to Judaea (i.e. those peoples living immediately around Judaea, areas such as Tyre, Idumaea, Samaria, etc.; and how many are 'distant' (i.e. those who are not direct neighbours, such as the Rome, Antioch, Babylon, etc.). Analysis reveals twenty-two in the former category and thirty in the later with two (Hellenes and Antiochenes) classified independently.⁹ This suggests a focus slightly in favour of 'distant' peoples or places (over those classified as 'local'). Furthermore, if we cross reference each people or place with the number of times it is mentioned the emphasis on the 'distant' category increases significantly: Fifty-seven (distant) versus thirty-six (local), with eleven references to the Hellenes and *Antiochenes*.¹⁰ While not in itself definitive this could provide the first indication that Second Maccabees is not primarily about Judas' campaigns against the 'surrounding nations'.

⁷ The seven references to Egypt are: II Macc. I.1, 10; IV.21; V.1, 8 11; and IX.29.

⁸ These fifty-four peoples and places are tabulated in Table Two, at Appendix Two.

⁹ This is the generally accepted definition of 'surrounding nations', along with the idea of longstanding opponents of Judaea; note Gruen: 'The campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus directed themselves in large part at enemies who had dwelled in the lands surrounding Judaea long before the advent of the Greeks ... The author of First Maccabees focuses attention upon the neighbouring communities and Peoples of Palestine and Transjordan, long-standing rivals of the Jews' [(1998) 5]. Each group or place is categorised as 'Distant' or 'Local' at Appendix Two, Table Two. Note references to the 'Ἕλληνες' are omitted because they often refer to cultural practices in Judaea. The second group omitted are the *Antiochenes* because they are most probably a class of citizenship rather than a different people as such.

¹⁰ I.e. Egypt is one place name categorised as 'Distant', but it is mentioned in the text of Second Maccabees seven times, see Appendix Two Table Two.

This notwithstanding these figures also present another pattern. The references to other peoples, especially those in the ‘surrounding nations’, tend to cluster into two Chapters (Four and Twelve).¹¹ In Chapter Four there are sixteen different peoples / places mentioned, of which four can be classified as ‘local’ and ten as ‘distant’ (as well as the Greeks and the *Antiochenes*). This ratio is adjusted slightly when we cross-reference the people or place with the number of times each appears: The ten distant groups remain at ten (i.e. they are mentioned once each), but the four ‘local’ groups rise to a total of seven references.¹² Despite this increase there is still an emphasis on distant groups.

The second Chapter of interest is Chapter Twelve in which we are presented with a slightly different scenario. There are fifteen different peoples/places present in this Chapter, of which thirteen can be categorised as ‘local’ and two as ‘distant’ groups. When we cross reference each ‘people’ with the total of number of times they actually appear we get a similar pattern to that which we saw in Chapter Four (above): The distant category remains at two, while the ‘local’ category rises to seventeen references.¹³ This demonstrates that ‘local’ groups or ‘surrounding nations’, if we utilise the current popular jargon, unequivocally dominates this Chapter. Whether, however, we should treat this scenario as indicative of Second Maccabees as a whole is questionable. This is only one

¹¹ Removing the ‘Hellenes’ and ‘Antiochenes’ there are a total of fifty-two places and peoples mentioned in Second Maccabees, twenty-seven (or 52%) can be found in Chapters Four and/or Twelve.

¹² The ‘distant’ groups and references in Second Maccabees, Chapter Four, are: Egypt IV.21; Coele-Syria and Phoenicia IV.4; Romans IV.11; Cypriots IV.29; Tarsus IV.30; Mallus IV.30; Daphne IV.33; Antioch IV.33; Cilicia IV.36; Scythians IV.47. The local groups and references are: Tyre IV.18, 32, 44, 49; Joppa IV.21; Phoenicia IV.22; Ammonites IV.26. There are also two references to *Antiochenes* [IV.9, 19] and four to Hellenes [IV.10, 13, 15, 36].

¹³ The ‘distant’ groups and references in Second Maccabees, Chapter Twelve, are: Cypriots XII.2 and Thracians XII.35. The ‘local’ groups and references are: Joppa XII.3; Arabs XII.10, 11; Idumaeans XII.32; Jamnia XII.8, 9; Kaspin XII.13; Jericho XII.15; Charax XII.17ff; Carnaim XII.21, 26; Ephron XII.27; Scythopolis XII.29, 30; Marisa XII.35; Adullam XII.38; Jaminites XII.40.

Chapter of fifteen and as it is about Judas' campaigning around Judaea we would expect local places/peoples to dominate.¹⁴ Of course such figures must be treated with caution: they in no way provide a definitive summation of subject matter. They do, however, provide an interesting pointer, perhaps even indicating that any dominate role ascribed to the 'surrounding nations' rests on artificially assessing small sections of the text as representative of the whole.

The Friendly Nations

It is interesting to determine whether or not each reference to peoples and places in Second Maccabees is presented in a 'Positive', 'Negative', or 'Descriptive' way by our author.¹⁵ Our aim, as usual, is to identify any patterns that may be indicative of social perceptions. To begin, there are eleven examples of peoples or places that can be categorised as 'Positive'. Unfortunately, they tell us very little. Consider the inhabitants of Bethsura [Beth-Zur], for example, a town located in Judaea, whose inhabitants successfully manage to withstand Lysias' siege, albeit with the eventual aid of Judas [II Macc. XI.5ff]. Even when we put aside the question as to whether or not Lysias did actually besiege this town, all the passage indicates is that other Jewish settlements outside the immediate control of Judas' army resisted the Seleucid forces.¹⁶ The

¹⁴ Consider our earlier observation, reached when we examined Second Maccabees as a whole, that more peoples/places can be categorised as 'distant' as opposed to 'local'. This in itself seems to militate against accepting the 'Surrounding Nations' hypothesis.

¹⁵ At Appendix Two, Table One, each reference is categorised as 'Negative', 'Positive', or 'Descriptive'. The categorisation is from the perspective of the Jews – or more specifically of our author.

¹⁶ Bethsura or Beth-Zur is located some twenty-eight kilometers to the South of Jerusalem. First and Second Maccabees disagree as to whether Lysias invaded Idumaea or Judaea, although the obvious solution is that he invaded Judaea via Idumaea, i.e. from the South. Josephus [*Antiquities* VII.5 (313)] and our author agree that Bethsura was at this time in Judaea, while the author of First Maccabees places it in Idumaea [I Macc. IV.29]. See Goldstein (1976) 269ff; (1983) 405.

observation in itself is hardly surprising as we would expect most people to defend their homes regardless of the origin of the threat.

A similar scenario also exists with regard to the Cilician cities of Tarsus and Mallus who rise in rebellion against Antiochus after they (the cities) are 'given' to Antiochis, the king's concubine [II Macc. IV.30]. These cities are at least 'foreign' (from a Jewish perspective) and can perhaps indicate that other peoples also found Antiochus' policies questionable. Therefore, while we do not know if the inhabitants of these cities agreed or disagreed with Judas' stand, their enemy was at least the same. This same rationale can be applied to the Persians who are categorised as 'positive' on one occasion because they also defeat and repel Antiochus [II Macc. IX.1ff].¹⁷

Perhaps more enlightening are the five references to the Romans. Three of these are 'Descriptive' (the senders of letters etc.), but two are positive: The first describes how a treaty of alliance and friendship had been established [II Macc. IV.11], while the second has the Romans acting on behalf of the Jews approving the concessions granted to the Jews by Lysias on behalf of the king [II Macc. XI.34].¹⁸ These references tend to support the hypothesis that at this time the Romans and Jews were on friendly terms, yet we should still be cautious. The reality is that this relationship probably has more to do with Roman foreign policy and the desire to undermine the power of the Hellenistic kingdoms than any true friendship with the Jews.¹⁹ After all, despite a supposed 'alliance'

¹⁷ There are four other references to the Persians, although they are 'Descriptive': see II Macc. I. 13, 19, 20, 33. There is also one 'Descriptive' reference to Persepolis [II Macc. IX.2] and Ecbatana [II Macc. IX.3].

¹⁸ II Macc. VIII.10, 36; XI.34. Note, however that II Macc. VIII.10 describes how Nicanor intended to sell off Jewish captives to pay off a tribute demanded by the Romans. This seems to indicate that the Romans were friendly as they saw fit: if politically and financially they were better served with another policy they would take it – they were not interested in how Nicanor raised the funds, they just wanted payment!

¹⁹ I.e. Rome's (token) support of the Jews can be seen as a hostile act by the Romans against the Seleucids. See Polybius III.4.3; XXXI.6, 10; Goldstein (1983) 424f.

[II Macc. IV.11], we do not see any practical support. Therefore, all we can conclude is that the references cited indicate a relationship with an outside power, albeit of a limited basis and of questionable value.

We also have two positive references to the Arabs. The first of these is in Chapter Five, where we are told how Jason, having failed to take control of the government in Jerusalem, sought asylum in Ammonite territory.²⁰ However, Aretas the ruler of the Arabs imprisoned him, and he fled from city to city hated as a renegade [II Macc. V.5-10]. In this account the Arabs seem to have no sympathy for an enemy of the Jewish people and it is through this 'sharing of a common foe' that we can categorise the reference as 'positive'. In reality this relationship has more to do with political expediency. The Arabs had previously given Jason support [II Macc. IV.19], but when he failed in his grasp at power they (the Arabs) sided with the stronger group.

The second reference also follows this pattern. In Chapter Twelve we hear how the Arabs seek a peace treaty with Judas [II Macc. XII.11]. The parley only occurs, however, straight after they fail in an assault against Judas.²¹ For his part, we learn that Judas accepts because he believed that the Arabs would be useful in many matters [II Macc. XII.12]. In other words, the relationship with the Arabs is defined as one of expediency for Judas – just as the relationship with the Romans was based on Roman foreign policy. In this sense we can legitimately question whether the Arabs (or any of the groups that we have mentioned) are 'friendly'. It seems clear that friendship (understand: 'Positive Categorisation') is very much based on circumstance and the ambition of individuals and/or groups at a particular point in time.

²⁰ Jason had earlier sought and received asylum here; see II Macc. IV.19.

²¹ II Macc. XII.10. This reference to 'Arabs' is categorised as 'Negative'. See Appendix Two, Table One.

This assessment contradicts most modern commentators who tend to interpret Second Maccabees as emphasising friendly relations between the Jews and Gentiles.²² Two passages regularly cited as demonstrating this are the alleged support of Seleucus IV in paying for Temple celebrations [II Macc. III.3]; and the apparent support of the Tyrians through their provision of a magnificent funeral for the Jewish accusers of Menelaus condemned to death by Antiochus [II Macc. IV.49]. Yet both these accounts are examples of a literary construction (*topos*) we introduced earlier: Exaggeration or an unlikely scenario is used in order to emphasise a point (so the unlikely generosity of the Tyrians emphasises how unjust Antiochus' actions were in condemning the Jewish representatives).²³ Therefore these accounts are not what they seem: context and our author's methodology alter the initial interpretation, so that we are at best identifying mutual indifference and at worst an active suspicion between the Jews and other peoples. Moreover, this interpretation is supported by other contemporary (or slightly later) evidence, such as First Maccabees and Tacitus.²⁴ This strongly suggests that we are being presented with an idea or concept that is accepted (or perceived to be real) by at least part of Jewish society, including those beyond the intended readership of Second Maccabees. As a result we should look very carefully at any account that alleges support for the Jews

²² See Goldstein (1976) 34; (1983) 241; Momigliano (1975a) 85-6; Johnson (2004) 14, 38-41, 51-52, 153.

²³ The marker for this construction is *ka'ì*, translated as 'even': so *even* Seleucus paid for Temple celebrations. See discussion and examples in Chapter Four above.

²⁴ See e.g. Goldstein [(1976) 34, 78] who suggests that in the attitudes expressed towards foreigners (Greeks) there is a significant difference between First and Second Maccabees. He compares, for example, the beginning of each Book: The condemnation of Seleucid kings and the adoption of gentile customs [I Macc. I.1-12] is contrasted with the apparent generosity of Seleucus IV [II Macc. III.2-3]. This interpretation of course does not include the literary *topos* we have identified (and ignores Seleucus IV's subsequent orders to Heliodorus). Tacitus' opinion of the Jews is well-documented [see Tac. *Hist.* V.2-5; Chilver G.E.F. *A Historical Commentary On Tacitus' "Histories" IV And V*. Completed and Revised by Townsend G.B. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1985) 90ff; Schürer (1986) III. 150ff], although it must be noted that Tacitus would have been influenced by political events after the era that we are discussing.

by foreigners and examine not only the context and literary patterning, but also question why the support is alleged.

The Enemies of the Jews

Let us now address the twenty-six references to peoples that we have categorised as having a negative relationship with the Jews. To begin, nine are a direct reference to the Greeks – or rather the Hellenes [‘Ἑλληνες]²⁵, and another two are to that obscure Hellenic group the *Antiochenes* [II Macc. IV.9, 19]. Each of these cases has been discussed in some detail in a previous chapter, so we do not need to repeat our analysis here – except, perhaps, to reiterate that each was classified as negative. With this in mind it is interesting to examine other occasions where, although the term ‘Ἑλληνες itself might not be used, there is still clear reference made to specific Greek persons, towns or regions.²⁶ Consider, once more, the enforced implementation of Hellenic customs described at the start of Chapter Six [II Macc. VI.1ff]: Antiochus sent an elderly Athenian to oversee the introduction of a policy which is perceived as threatening Jewish identity. It is the use of an Athenian to implement this policy that interests us here. In a practical sense this does not seem to be unusual: Ptolemy uses an Athenian to advise on religious matters and Athens is seen as the cultural and educational centre of Hellenistic times.²⁷ Nevertheless, the use of an Athenian does provide the king’s policy with a direct Greek association, which in turn has two implications: First, it further reinforces the descriptions

²⁵ The references are: II Macc. IV.10, 13, 15, 36; VI.8, 9; XI.2, 24; XIII.2. See Chapter Four above.

²⁶ Our analysis here will be limited to Greek places and cities listed at Appendix Two. For completeness, however, the conclusions we reach should be considered in conjunction with those of Chapter Seven.

²⁷ See Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride* XXVIII (362); Tac. *Hist.* IV.83; Chilver (1985) 85-6. Antiochus’ misguided offer to the Jews [II Macc. IX.15] further demonstrates our author’s awareness of the role of Athens in the Hellenistic world.

we are given of the Jews being made to conform to 'the Greek way of life'. An Athenian is imposing (unwanted) practices that are perceived and labelled as Hellenic (whatever the reality). Second, since the changes are not well-received – as the rest of Chapter Six goes on to vividly describe – the Athenian has a negative role, which further develops (from our author's perspective) the relationship between 'Greekness' and negativity.

The next two references to consider are to Macedonians, both of which occur in Chapter Eight when Maccabaeus is urging his followers forward in the face of overwhelming numerical opposition.²⁸ To do so Maccabaeus recounts how in a battle against the Galatians in Babylon the Jews fought bravely and successfully against overwhelming numbers while the Macedonians panicked. Even though there may be some debate as to the historicity of this account – or at least what battle or conflict our author could be referring to – the underlying impression of the Macedonians remains.²⁹ Our author chooses to present a version of events where the Jews led the way to victory, while their comrades in arms, the Macedonians, are unreliable, almost cowardly – at the very least they are inferior to the Jews. Reading the text in this way is interesting. The reality is that for our author and his audience the power and might of the Macedonian military is indisputable – yet this is not what is presented. Certainly Jewish status is advanced by this story, but it also seems probable that the derision of the Macedonians is

²⁸ Both these references are at II Macc. VIII.20. We should also make clear at this point that the Macedonians (and for that matter the Thracians whom we will introduce shortly) were, by the Second Century B.C.E., Hellenised. While it is acknowledged that, strictly speaking, the Macedonians (and the Thracians) are ethnically distinct from the Greeks, the difference would be hardly noticeable to any outside (i.e. non Greek) observer. The author of First Maccabees, for example, identifies a relationship – through Alexander the Great – between Macedon, *Kittim* (Greece) and the Seleucids [I Macc. I. 1-10].

²⁹ There is no record of the Galatians penetrating so deep into Seleucid territory. They did, however, invade central Anatolia in the Third Century B.C.E., settling there and becoming a menace to communities in the region. See Hansen E.V. *The Attalids of Pergamon*. Second Ed. Series: Cornell Studies in Classical Philology Vol. 36 (Cornell: Ithaca and London; 1971) 28-31. The Galatians referred to may be mercenaries in an imperial army as Goldstein suggests [(1983) 332ff].

a continuation of the negative perception our author seems to have of the Hellenes in general. We could even go so far as to speculate that this ‘negative reinforcement’ could have been the purpose of the passage. It may have been significant that our author’s usual practice of using a Biblical example was rejected in favour of the Macedonian story.³⁰

This leaves two further examples. The first is the description of how a Thracian horseman bore down on Dositheus and chopped off his arm, thereby allowing the Seleucid commander Gorgias to flee the battle.³¹ Of course, it would be foolish to read anything significant into this account, although it gains some credence in that the presence of a Thracian cavalry unit attached to the position of Governor of Idumaea may not be unusual.³² Regardless of the reality, the importance for us is how the pattern of negativity towards Hellenic groups is continued: after all Gorgias’ saviour could equally have been described as one of his mercenaries or a bodyguard from an attached royal unit or the equivalent. Yet our author chose to describe him as a ‘Thracian’, which in his eyes was as a Hellene.

Our final example in this section is the reference to the Spartans [II Macc. V.9]. This passage is generally interpreted in a positive sense whereby the Jews are trying to

³⁰ Compare (e.g.) II Macc. XII.14-16, where our author uses a Biblical analogy – Joshua VI.1-21. Note also that this interpretation of our author’s perception is valid regardless of whether the Macedonians are meant here in a literal sense or whether it is intended as a generic label for the Seleucid force. Cf. Edson C. ‘Imperium Macedonicum: The Seleucid Empire and the Literary Evidence’. In *Classical Philology* 53 (1958) 153-70 esp. 163; and for an outline of the Macedonian numbers in the Seleucid Army see Bar-Kochva B. *The Seleucid Army: Organisation and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge, 1976).

³¹ II Macc. XII.35. Dositheus is described here as a Tubian Jew in order to distinguish him from the Dositheus at XII.19, 24.

³² Thracian cavalry seem to have been part of the Mercenary Forces in the royal army, units of which were at the disposal of the governor of Idumaea (i.e. Gorgias). See the description of the royal forces that parade in Antioch during the games put on by Antiochus IV [Polybius XXX.25.5; Goldstein (1983) 446]. Of course this description in itself does not mean that Thracian cavalry were always with the governor of Idumaea – our author could be retrojecting a later development.

acknowledge some form of Hellenic identity in order to provide a sort of validity to themselves as a people. For the most part this interpretation is consistent with the details that the author of First Maccabees provides, but – as we shall see – it does not necessarily relate to what is presented in Second Maccabees. The important observation for us is not so much the history of the alleged relationship or any other representations of it, but rather how our author treats that relationship.³³ Let us consider the relevant passage:

Πέρας οὖν κακῆς καταστροφῆς ἔτυχεν. ἐγκληθεὶς πρὸς Ἀρέταν τὸν τῶν Ἀράβων τύραννον, πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως φεύγων, διωκόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων, στυγούμενος ὡς τῶν νόμων ἀποστάτης καὶ βδελυσσόμενος ὡς πατρίδος καὶ πολιτῶν δῆμιος, εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐξεβράσθη. Καὶ ὁ συχνοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἀποξενώσας ἐπὶ ξένης ἀπώλετο, πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀναχθεὶς, ὡς διὰ τὴν συγγενίαν τευζόμενος σκέπης·

‘Then finally he came to a miserable end. He was imprisoned by Aretas the ruler of the Arabs, then fled from city to city, being pursued by all, hated as a rebel against the laws and as an abomination against both his country and fellow citizens, so he was cast out into Egypt. Then he, who had driven out so many from their homeland, died in a foreign land having gone to Sparta in order to seek refuge because of a kindred relationship’.

[II Macc. V.8-9]

In the first part of this passage we receive a degrading description of Jason which is consistent with our author’s earlier treatment of him. In short, we are informed that

³³ As we would expect there has been a lot of discussion of this alleged kinship between the Jews and Spartans. As indicated it is usually interpreted as a way for the Jews to support a claim for equal rights with the Greeks – but this is not necessarily consistent with what the author of Second Maccabees writes. See our discussion below. Our later conclusions notwithstanding, it is possible that the Jews tried to use an alleged ‘kinship’ between Spartans and themselves as an entry ticket into European culture – this is consistent with the actions of other peoples in the region, see e.g. the Tyrians’ alleged relationship with the people of Delphi [SEG 2, 330]; although the Jews did go one stage further and suggest that the Spartans were descendants of Abraham and therefore their colony! See I Macc. XII.5-23; Josephus *Antiquities* XII 225-7, XIII.166-70; Hengel (1974) I.72ff, II.50ff; Jones A.H.M. *The Greek City: From Alexander To Justinian* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1940) 50. It is also possible that this passage is just a literary description of a fact accepted by the Jewish people and nothing more can be or should be read into it. We should also note that acceptance of the account in First Maccabees is the norm, thereby supporting our assertion that this text is usually given primacy over Second Maccabees.

towards the end of his life Jason could not find peace anywhere and ended up seeking refuge in Sparta. Certainly this account is rich in irony – Jason who cast out so many of his fellow citizens ended his days in a foreign land. This notwithstanding, why did our author choose Sparta as Jason’s intended place of refuge and does his representation support the idea of a positive relationship between the Jews and the Spartans? The answer to the first part of this question must be distance: Sparta was a territory far removed from Jason’s ‘ancestral grave’ – thereby his plight is emphasised. We could also suggest, based on our analysis to date, that the choice of an Hellenic destination further denigrates Jason: our author could be indicating where Jason’s true loyalties lay.

It is interesting that if these suppositions are true then this story is not an indication of a positive relationship between the Jews and the Spartans. In fact, to the contrary, what our author is demonstrating is that the Spartans are harbouring a fugitive of the Jewish people. There is still, however, the issue of kinship as mentioned toward the end of our passage. There is no doubt that this could be understood as referring to a relationship between Jews and Spartans in general. Nevertheless it is also possible that the ‘kinship’ could be understood on a personal level, that is between Jason and the Spartans on the basis of some familial relationship. Understanding the text in this way is consistent with our assessment of the Jewish-Hellenic relationship, while also providing support for our assessment of our author’s perception of the Hellenes.³⁴

There is one other interesting observation that we can make about this passage: we are not actually told if the Spartans accept Jason or exactly where he was buried – all

³⁴ It also affects the accepted relationship between First and Second Maccabees. The supposed kinship between Jews and Spartans is introduced by the author of First Maccabees. It is possible that he expanded upon the personal association suggested in this passage between Jason and the Spartans in order to invent for the Jews a relationship with the “Greeks” as other local peoples had done. Afterall, there is doubt concerning the authenticity of the letter to the Spartans [I Macc. XII.5-23 and Jos. *Ant.* XIII.5, 8 (166-70)] and the subsequent reply [I Macc. XIV.16-23]; see Schürer (1973) I. 184 esp. n.32. Consider also that this provides support for our assertion that Second Maccabees is earlier than First Maccabees.

we know is that it was not Judaea. If the Spartans refused Jason then this could be taken as demonstrating some degree of support to (their kin) the Jews. However, this is unlikely. Not only is it reading a lot into an omission in the text, it is also contrary to our understanding to date of the work as a whole: we would not expect an Hellenic state to be presented in this way. Nevertheless, let us persist with the possibility that our author could be developing the irony in the passage and manipulating the well known *topos* of dying in a foreign land (dislocation).³⁵ Through a subtle omission our author is suggesting that not only did Jason die in exile, but that he was rejected by his (Spartan) kin and an Hellenic nation. The enhancement of the irony in this reading is appealing, while the ideology is not dissimilar to the ‘exaggeration’ literary construction (marked by καί: even) identified earlier.³⁶

There is one other reference to an Hellenic ‘group’ that we should mention at this time. In Chapter Nine we have a ‘Descriptive’ reference to the Athenians:³⁷ According to our author Antiochus, on his death bed and wracked with pain, finally ‘sees the light’ and promises to give the Jews equal privileges to those enjoyed by the citizens of Athens. The promises are not, however, all that they seem. In the mind of the unreformed Antiochus Athens is represented as the zenith of human civilisation, while the Jews are viewed as the absolute nadir (‘the fodder for the birds of prey’ [II Macc. IX.15]). The reformed

³⁵ Our author uses irony and this same *topos* elsewhere – King Antiochus, for example, dies in a foreign land. However, we are also specifically told that Antiochus’ body is returned to his homeland [II Macc. IX.28]. This contrasts directly with Jason whose body does not rest in an ancestral grave – a detail which could further emphasise our author’s hostility toward Jason.

³⁶ This particular example, of course, is not actually a part of this *topos* as the marker (καί) is not present. The point is that the underlying ideology is similar: (even) the Spartans (understand ‘Hellenes’ and ‘Jason’s kin’) rejected him in life and death.

³⁷ II Macc. IX.15. While the reference is categorised as descriptive (since it is a literary construct) the context and our upcoming discussion (see below) suggest it should perhaps best be categorised as negative.

Antiochus will reverse this assessment and switch from supporting Hellenic culture to Jewish culture: the Jews will take the position of the Athenians.³⁸ The problem is that the circumstances with which our author lets Antiochus make his offer demonstrates that he does not believe Antiochus' sincerity and neither it seems does the Lord [II Macc. IX.18]. Furthermore, the account is rich with irony: even on his death-bed Antiochus does not understand that the Jews do not want to be Athenians (Hellenes). This ideology is reinforced by the subsequent use of our now familiar literary construct: Antiochus 'even [καί] promises to turn Jew' [II Macc. IX.17]. The obvious is not the reality in this passage. The role for the Athenians is as the antithesis of the Jews, which of course means that they (i.e. the Hellenes) cannot be viewed positively.³⁹

We have now considered every occasion that the Hellenes are referred to either as a specific group (Athenian, Macedonian, etc.) or under the generic label 'Ἕλληνες. Our discussion demonstrates that every reference is negative or at best we can categorise some as 'Descriptive' – but even then we can detect some degree of anti-Hellenic bias. Furthermore, in the context of our initial discussion concerning the twenty-six negative references to 'other nations', it is clear that well over half (sixteen) can be categorised in some way as Hellenic. This observation goes someway in explaining how, despite the

³⁸ See II Macc. IX.15: 'But he would make all the Jews, whom he had [hitherto] not judged to be worthy of burial, but [rather] of being thrown to the dumb beasts as fodder for birds of prey, the equals of [what] the Athenians [had hitherto been]' [τοὺς δὲ Ἰουδαίους, οὓς διεγνώκει μηδὲ ταφῆς ἀξιῶσαι, οἰωνοβρώτους δὲ σὺν τοῖς νηπίοις ἐκρίψειν θηρίοις, πάντας αὐτοὺς ἴσους Ἀθηναίοις ποιήσειν].

The choice of the Athenians is also interesting since Athens is outside of the Seleucid Empire and it is an Athenian whom Antiochus uses to introduce the Hellenic customs so despised by our author [II Macc. VI.1ff]. It would have been known that Antiochus was a great admirer of Athenian culture, he had after all spent time there on his way back from Rome [Appian *Syr.* XI.45; Polybius XXVI.1; OGIS I no. 248 vv. 55-56; Mørkholm O. *Antiochus IV of Syria* (København, 1966) 40ff]. It is also interesting to note how there is no mention of granting any such privileges to the Jews in the cited letter II Macc. IX.19-27.

³⁹ Strangely most commentators interpret the representation of the Athenians here as positive. See, e.g. Goldstein who argues that 'Jason assumes to be treated like an Athenian is a privilege' [(1983) 356].

infrequency of the use of the term 'Ἑλληνες itself, the Jewish-Greek dichotomy can still be considered central to the text: 'an Hellenic presence' underlies the majority of the events related to peoples and places that threaten the Jews. It is also interesting that all things directly Hellenic seem to be demonstrably negative. Consider how not one of the references to an Hellenic people, place or concept (in our study to date) is demonstrably positive or supportive of the Jews.

With this in mind, let us continue with our analysis, we still have ten examples to discuss. Two of these we have made mention of in relation to the role of the Arabs and their (initial) support of Jason. As circumstances changed it is apparent that the Arabs altered their view and relationship with the Jewish people, thereby demonstrating a degree of political expediency.⁴⁰ There are two other references that also do not warrant much discussion. The first is to the Mysian Mercenaries [II Macc. V.24]. These are simply a group of soldiers from the north-west of Anatolia who are under the command of one Apollonius. They are sent by the king (Antiochus IV) to slaughter all the Jewish adult males and to sell the women and children into slavery. In reality these mercenaries are just a part of the execution of the king's policy, but their actions are negative from the perspective of the Jews. The second reference we can understand in a similar way. We are told that Timotheus raised a large force of Asian horses and marched against Judaea [II Macc. X.24]. The reference to 'Asian' horses is here used to symbolise the terrifying strength and size of this army by invoking images of the frightening battle horses of Iran. Meanwhile the campaign itself is understood by our author to be a part of a wider Seleucid (Hellenic) policy.⁴¹ In both examples, therefore, there is a link to the Hellenes

⁴⁰ The two negative references are II Macc. IV.26 (Ammonites) and XII.10 (Arabs); there are two positive references [II Macc. V.8; XII.11 (both to Arabs)] and one descriptive reference [II Macc. V.7 (Ammonites)]. See earlier discussion, this chapter.

⁴¹ On the Asian horses see Bar-Kochva (1976) 514. Second Maccabees clearly presents Timotheus as acting in concert with Seleucid officials, but does not assign him a Seleucid rank (ὁ στρατηγός see Bar-Kochva

through the king's (Hellenic) policies or the actions of perceived Seleucid (Hellenic) agents. The connection is weak, but within the framework of our definition and discussion, so worth noting.

This leaves us with six negative references. Each is to a 'surrounding nation' and each is related to uprisings against local governors or Seleucid policy. This suggests that these references are central to the hypothesis that Judas campaigned against the historical enemies of the Jews. It is surprising, therefore, that there are only six specific examples!⁴² Certainly this number can be increased, to some extent, by the inclusion of accounts that tend to be descriptive in nature, but where indirect hostility toward Judas is also implied. Consider the town of Carnaim. It is to this town that Timotheus (an enemy of Judas and the Jewish people) sends women, children and supplies when he learns of Judas' advance [II Macc. XII.21]. Therefore, as a named destination Carnaim can, technically, only be categorised as descriptive. However, the town's people apparently accept and harbour the people and supplies that Timotheus sends, so we have an indication of support being provided to Judas' enemy – hence the 'tending toward negative' label.⁴³ There are six of these examples that relate to towns/peoples in the region immediately surrounding Judaea.⁴⁴ Yet even when we combine these possible negative entries with the six definite

(1976) 85-93). Some have tried to make him a Seleucid official [e.g. Bringmann (1983) 61], but in First Maccabees he is in the Transjordan as leader of the Ammonites [I Macc. V.6-8].

⁴² The six references are II Macc. X.15, 16 [Idumaeans]; X.32 [Gazara, or possibly 'Iazer' as in I Macc. V.3-5]; XII.3 [Joppa]; XII.8, 40 [Jaminites].

⁴³ The possibility that Carnaim was understood to support Timotheus is further reinforced a few lines later when Judas attacks the city and kills Twenty-Five Thousand people: II Macc. XII. 26.

⁴⁴ The six 'tending toward negative' references are II Macc. XII.13, 17ff, 21, 26, 27, 29 – note that they are all in Chapter Twelve. There are a further two references that have been categorised as 'Descriptive (Negative)', but they are not to towns immediately surrounding or threatening Judaea: II Macc. V.22; XII.2. See Appendix Two, Table One.

ones, we are still only left with a total of twelve references. This in itself begins to throw some doubt on the hypothesis that these groups are the true opponents of Judas.

This sort of analysis can, of course, only give us general trends or point to areas towards which we should direct our attention. Analysis of specific examples is more relevant and informative. To that end let us examine the six ‘negative’ references in more detail. First we have the Idumaeans, mentioned twice in the following passage:

Γοργίας δὲ γενόμενος στρατηγὸς τῶν τόπων ἐξενοτρόφει, καὶ παρ’ ἑκάστα πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπολεμοτρόφει. ὁμοῦ δὲ τούτῳ καὶ οἱ Ἰδουμαῖοι ἐγκρατεῖς ἐπικαίρων ὀχυρωμάτων ὄντες, ἐγύμναζον τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καὶ τοὺς φυγαδεύσαντας ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προσλαβόμενοι πολεμοτροφεῖν ἐπεχείρουν. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον, ποιησάμενοι λιτανείαν καὶ ἀξιώσαντες τὸν θεὸν σύμμαχον αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι, ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν Ἰδουμαίων ὀχυρώματα ὥρμησαν·

‘Gorgias having become governor [strategos] of the territories hired mercenaries and in every way sought hostilities against the Jews. At the same time as these things the Idumaeans, who were in control of strategic strongholds also harassed the Jews; they took into partnership the renegades from Jerusalem and seized the opportunity to promote war. The men with Maccabaeus, having offered prayers and expecting God to be their ally, marched against the strongholds of the Idumaeans.’⁴⁵

This description of events seems to indicate that the Idumaeans were acting independently of Gorgias, attacking the Jews for their own purposes albeit at the same time as Gorgias’ action. Understanding the text in this way supports the idea that Judas was under threat from the individual nations around him: Idumaea is attacking Judaea for independent, probably political and/or opportunistic, reasons. Closer scrutiny of the passage, however, raises some questions as to the validity of this interpretation. Gorgias’ vague title as the ‘Governor [or General] of the Territories’ [στρατηγὸς τῶν τόπων]

⁴⁵ II Macc. X.14-16. Part of this passage has been cited previously, albeit in a different context [see Chapter Three, text to n.9 and following]. That interpretation does not affect our current discussion.

suggests he controlled several regions, one of which was demonstrably Idumaea: In a following passage Gorgias has the title 'Governor [General] of Idumaea'.⁴⁶ This connection strongly suggests that the Idumaeans were acting in concert with or under instructions from Gorgias.⁴⁷ In turn, this presents us with the possibility of an Hellenic association. Josephus indicates that Gorgias (along with Ptolemy and Nicanor) were 'men of power among the friends of the king' and despatched by Lysias to attack Judaea.⁴⁸ This hypothesis is supported in our cited passage by the description of how the renegades from Jerusalem joined the efforts against the Jews. These 'renegade Jews' can only be that group that we have previously labelled (albeit very broadly) as 'Hellenisers', the supporters of the policies that Jason and Menelaus attempted to implement. Our author provides no indication of any other group to which we could apply this phrase. This suggests that Hellenised Jews and ranking Hellenic officials were acting due to a deliberate policy (of Antiochus V).⁴⁹

The only apparent problem with this interpretation can be found in Josephus, who indicates that Gorgias was the governor of Jamnia not Idumaea.⁵⁰ The easiest way for us

⁴⁶ II Macc. XII.32: Γοργίαν τὸν τῆς Ἰδουμαίας στρατηγόν. Goldstein also has one Gorgias at X.15 and XII.32 [(1983) 389].

⁴⁷ A possibility also recognised by Goldstein (1983) 389.

⁴⁸ Josephus *Antiquities* XII.7.3 (298): ἄνδρας δυνατοὺς τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως.

⁴⁹ That these officials are supporters of Antiochus V is shown by II Macc.X.10ff, where our author observes that Antiochus V succeeds his father Antiochus IV. This could just be a connecting passage providing some sort of chronological structure, however we also hear of political appointments and policy reasons for these appointments: i.e. an account, including reasons, for Protarchos' appointment as Governor of Coele-Syria / Phoenicia [II Macc. X.12ff]. Now, the passages following these descriptions relate to Gorgias and his actions. Considering that we are being presented with an epitome and must accept that not all relevant details will be provided by our author, the relative positions of the passages concerning Gorgias and Antiochus V (and Protarchos) should be enough to suggest a relationship. Supporting this interpretation is Josephus' presentation of Gorgias as a powerful friend of the king [*Antiquities* XII.7.3 (298)].

⁵⁰ Josephus identifies Gorgias as the 'strategos of Jamnia' [*Antiquities* XII.8.6 (351)].

to deal with this issue is to follow Goldstein who suggests that Josephus simply got it wrong. However, let us consider the possibility that Josephus is correct and that when our author came to write his account, he found in his source no Greek governor for the Idumaeans. To make his point that the Greeks were behind the attacks on the Jews our author had to manufacture a Greek governor. To do this he could have taken Gorgias from Jamnia (where he belongs according to Josephus) and set him down in Idumaea where he is needed. The underlying point, regardless of the reality, is that in Second Maccabees, Gorgias is the governor of Idumaea and our author had a reason for presenting him as such.⁵¹

The remaining four passages can be separated into two groups based on the Chapters within which they appear. First we have Judas' siege of Gazara [II Macc. X.32ff] (or possibly 'Iazer' as in I Macc. V.3-5). In this passage Timotheus had fled to Gazara and he, along with the garrisoned force that was there, barricaded themselves in the stronghold and taunted the Jewish army with insults. It took five days for Judas and his followers finally to capture the city, whereupon they destroyed it and massacred all the survivors of the siege: our author describes how 'the Jews burnt the blasphemers

⁵¹ The corresponding account of these events in First Maccabees seems to make it clear that the enemy was the surrounding nations [I Macc. V.1-2]. In short, we learn that they attack because the Jews have rebuilt the altar and rededicated the Temple. This an action and justification that in themselves seem illogical until we recognise that this passage is actually a literary allusion to Erza IV.1,4 and Nehemiah IV.1ff. Be that as it may, other theories have been suggested: Goldstein, for example, proposes that the rededication signifies a fulfilment of God's prophecies and as a result the surrounding nations became afraid [(1976) 293]; a theory that can at best be described as speculative. A more likely scenario is Goldstein's secondary argument that a fear of difference fuelled by Jewish isolationism developed [(1976) 199-200, 293], especially if we consider that the rededication of the Temple probably also marks a resurgence of Jews adhering to the Torah. This would result in the Jews living in these surrounding cities rejecting some Hellenic (local) practices, possibly withdrawing more from their fellow residents – all in favour of following their traditional law. This could have caused suspicion and resentment prompting some action. In addition, the actions against the Jews are not presented as isolated events (i.e. occurring in only one city or region), so they could have been perceived (by the Jews) as being a part of the Seleucid campaigns (regardless of the reality).

alive'.⁵² The hostility between the two armies is self evident, yet it is interesting that it is the men under Judas' command who carry out the bloody massacre. Our author does provide an explanation for these acts, namely that Timotheus is holed up in the city and that the defenders verbally abuse them. It may be that our author's audience perceived this as ample justification for the elimination of a town, although I suspect the destruction was a response to earlier actions by Timotheus when Judas was otherwise engaged. Be that as it may, the way the account is presented arouses the suspicion that Judas was not seeking vengeance, but was the aggressor actively expanding his influence.

The remaining three references are in Chapter Twelve. First, we have a description of the atrocities done to the Jews by the citizens of Joppa: The people of Joppa tricked the Jews that lived among them (i.e. in the city of Joppa) onto boats. They then set sail out into the harbour, the boats were sunk, and it is reported that two hundred Jews drowned [II Macc. XII.3-4]. Judas responded by setting the harbour on fire and killing whomever he encountered. The town itself, however, was closed against him. So Judas withdrew intending, we learn, to return to wipe out the entire community [II Macc. XII.7]. To some extent the actions by Judas here seem understandable. Even so the extent of retribution required is worth noting: The destruction of the harbour was not sufficient retribution, the promise of a future massacre is needed. This raises the level of violence to that which we observed at Gazara, the similarity (in degree) perhaps providing support for our comments on social and/or literary expectations. The same holds for Judas' action against the Jamnites. We learn that the flames from Jamnia could be seen in Jerusalem some forty-eight kilometres distant [II Macc. XII.9]. Yet the people of Jamnia had not actually done anything: Judas is striking first and destroying communities on the *possibility* that they may turn on the Jews in their city.

⁵² II Macc X.36: ζῶντας τοὺς βλασφήμους κατέκαλον.

The third negative reference from Chapter Twelve is also to the Jamnites. We are informed how Judas and his followers defeated Gorgias in battle [II Macc. XII.36-37]. Then, when they returned to the battlefield to collect the bodies of their fallen, they discovered consecrated idols of the Jamnites under the cloaks of the dead. Such idols are forbidden by Jewish law (Torah), and this, it is suggested, is why these Jewish soldiers perished – not an unsurprising assertion considering our author's emphasis on the importance of religion.⁵³ At any rate, all that the above descriptions actually confirm is a hostility by some of the surrounding nations towards Judas and his followers (or perhaps more accurately 'Jews' regardless). However, confirming that some of the surrounding nations were hostile does not in itself tell us a great deal. Nor do these (limited) references suggest that conflict against the surrounding nations should be considered a central theme of the text.

Second Maccabees, Chapter Twelve

Earlier we indicated that Chapter Twelve requires special attention as the local (surrounding) nations dominate. To some extent this should not surprise as, for the most part, it describes Judas' campaigning in the lands around Judaea. Still a detailed case study is instructive. To begin, there are a total of nineteen references to peoples or places in this Chapter most of which we have discussed to some extent previously. Leaving aside these examples we are still left with ten references to consider.⁵⁴ Each is categorised

⁵³ See II Macc. XII.40. For the law forbidding idols see (e.g.) Deuteronomy VII.25-6. The idols themselves were probably looted in the recent campaign against the city [II Macc. XII.8ff]. This passage demonstrates a fundamental difference between First and Second Maccabees. In First Maccabees the Jewish soldiers die not because they break Jewish law but through their own desire for glory [I Macc. V.67] – Religion is more central to Second Maccabees. For other interpretations/comments see Goldstein (1983) 448ff.

⁵⁴ Five of the nineteen we have classified as negative and discussed in the preceding section [II Macc. XII.3 (Joppa), XII.8, 40 (Jamnites – mentioned twice), XII.10 (Arabs), XII.35 (Thracians)]. Of these only three

as ‘Descriptive’, although some (six) tend toward negative and one tends toward positive. What all these references have in common, however, is that they each present us with contact between Judas and the residents of a city around Judaea (i.e. a ‘surrounding nation’). Moreover, they all seem to share a common underlying factor. As demonstrative consider our author’s account of Judas’ advance against the city of Kaspin:

Ἐπέβαλεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τινα πόλιν [γεφύραις], ὀχυρὰν καὶ τείχεσιν περιπεφραγμένην καὶ παμμειγέσιν ἔθνεσιν κατοικουμένην, ὄνομα δὲ Κασπιν.

He [Judas] also advanced against a certain city named Kaspin, a strong and well fortified place inhabited by a very mixed gentile population.⁵⁵

Our author then goes on to describe how well fortified the town is, how the citizens abuse the besieging Jews and adds a Biblical comparison to how the Lord hands Jericho to the Jews in the time of Joshua.⁵⁶ He then describes Judas’ subsequent actions:

peoples are considered a ‘surrounding nation’ (Joppa, Jamnia, and the Arabs), the Thracians are clearly ‘distant’. Moreover, the Arabs are classified as both negative (they attack Judas) and then positive (they establish a treaty between themselves and the Jews, cf. XII.11). Removing the five references still leaves us with fourteen, one of which is to another ‘distant’ location (Cypriots: Nicanor is described as the chief of the Cypriot mercenaries [II Macc. XII.2]). Another is to Jericho and is part of an analogy to great deeds of the past used by Judas to inspire his followers [II Macc. XII.15]. Both of these can be omitted. Finally we have discussed two positive references previously [II Macc. XII.11, 38]. This leaves us with ten references.

⁵⁵ II Macc. XII.13. The location of Kaspin is uncertain. I have followed Goldstein in locating it on the site of “Khisfin”, which is by a swamp that could equate to the lake mentioned at II Macc. XII.16. See Goldstein (1983) 439; Abel (1949) 436. Note also that the text at this point is made difficult by the inclusion of the term γεφύραις. In Codex Alexandrinus we find Γεφρούν, which closely resembles the noun γέφυρα [dam, mound, bridge] or verb γεφυρώ [to bridge over]. Neither term makes any sense in the context of our passage. To complicate matters further, this word is not in Lucian’s text, nor is it found in the old Latin translations. Goldstein suggests that the term is a scribal error, noting that ‘Gephron’ is another name for the city ‘Ephron’ (see Polybius V.70.12) and that a description of Ephron similar to the above account on Kaspin occurs a little later in the Chapter [II Macc. XII.27]: see Goldstein (1983) 439, Abel (1949) 435-6. Codex Venetus simply omits the term as do most translators. In this instance we also have elected not to translate it.

⁵⁶ II Macc. XII.14-16. The Biblical comparison is to Joshua VI.1-21.

Καταλαβόμενοι τε τὴν πόλιν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θελήσει ἀμυθήτους ἐποίησαντο σφαγάς, ὥστε τὴν παρακειμένην λίμνην τὸ πλάτος ἔχουσιν σταδίου δύο κατάρρυτον αἵματι πεπληρωμένην φαίνεσθαι.

‘Capturing the city through the will of God they undertook a massive slaughter, such that the lake beside the city, which was two stadia wide, seemed to have been filled by the blood flowing into it’. [II Macc. XII.16]

Taken together these passages demonstrate two issues. First, once Judas has secured victory he does not just demand that the city’s populace support the Jews, or even be obedient to him; instead, he massacres them. The extent of the killing is presented through a vivid account of a nearby lake overflowing with blood. This is the same sort of dramatic exaggeration identified earlier, although this time we have an indication as to why the massacres are included: our author was equating Judas’ expedition with the great battles of Jewish history. The bloody image presented here follows an analogy to the destruction of Jericho by Joshua where all the citizens were put to the sword: men, women, children and even the cattle.⁵⁷

Second, it is made clear that Judas attacks Kaspin. We receive no reason for the attack. There is no indication that the Jews are being mistreated by the other residents of the city, nor is there any indication that they intended to cause the Jews any harm.⁵⁸ All we learn is that the town was inhabited by a mixed population of Gentiles (a description that we should take as derogatory), and that *after* the assault had begun the city’s inhabitants hurled insults against the Jews.⁵⁹ Our author quite clearly recognises that there

⁵⁷ Joshua VI.17 and 21 which tell how everyone who was not in the house of the prostitute Rahab was to be executed, an act which the victorious Jews carried out. Such analogies of course provide further indication of a literary licence in presenting these accounts.

⁵⁸ In our previous discussions of Judas’ attacks against cities we noted the justification provided, be it the killing of Jews (Joppa: II Macc. XII. 3), or the planning of similar atrocities (Jamnia: II Macc. XII.8ff).

⁵⁹ II Macc. XII.13-14. Mixed parentage is seen as a derogatory characteristic among both the Greeks and the Jews, see Isocrates IV.24; Numbers XI.4; Nehemiah XIII.3; Philo *In Flaccum* I.4, *De Legatione ad*

was hostility between the two groups but he seems unable to place the blame for the conflict directly on the 'Gentiles'. The author of First Maccabees suggests that many Jews were being held captive in the fortified towns of Bosora and Bosora-in-Alema, Kaspho, Maked, and Karnaim (where Kaspho probably equates to Kaspin), because local Gentiles were angry that the Temple had been rebuilt.⁶⁰ This would provide a reason for the attack, but it is demonstrably not responsible for Judas' actions according to the author of Second Maccabees. While our author acknowledges that the Temple's revival caused conflict, by the time the events in Chapter Twelve are being related this disagreement had been resolved [II Macc. XI. 13-38].

This leaves us with a dilemma: Why did Judas campaign against the surrounding nations? Our author provides one possible reason, at the start of the Chapter we are informed that some Hellenic officers would not let the Jews live in peace:

Γενομένων δὲ τῶν συνθηκῶν τούτων, ὁ μὲν Λυσίας ἀπῆει πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ τὴν γεωργίαν ἐγίνοντο. Τῶν δὲ κατὰ τόπον στρατηγῶν Τιμόθεος καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Γενναίου, ἔτι δὲ Ἱερώνυμος καὶ Δημοφών, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Νικάνωρ ὁ Κυπριάρχης, οὐκ εἶον αὐτοὺς εὐσταθεῖν καὶ τὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἄγειν.

'When these treaties had been made [i.e. the resolution of the conflict begun by the reconstruction of the Temple] Lysias marched away to the king and the Jews began to concern themselves with farming. However, the officers of the regions Timotheus and Apollonius son of Gennaeus, as well as Hieronymos and Demophon together with Nicanor the Cypriarch, would not allow them [the Jews] to live in tranquil and peaceful ways'. [II Macc. XII.1-2]

Gaium XVIII.120; Goldstein (1983) 439; our discussion (with references) in Chapter One. The idealistic belief that 'purity' is best reinforces a negative interpretation of the above passage. This point is raised again in another discussion on II Macc. XII.13 that occurs in the following chapter.

⁶⁰ See I Macc. V.26 and V.1-2. Note also Josephus *Antiquities* XII.8.3 (335-6, 340). For the arguments equating Kaspho and Kaspin see Goldstein (1976) 301, (1983) 439.

Our author is clear that these ‘officers’ disrupt the daily life of the Jews. The location of this assertion before the beginning of Judas’ campaign strongly implies a cause and effect relationship. An observation reinforced by one named officer (Timotheus) who becomes the primary opponent of Judas throughout the rest of the book.⁶¹ This causal relationship can of course be accepted or rejected. If we reject it, we must also be implying that Judas’ campaign was, for the most part, not defensive but offensive. Many of the descriptions we are given of his assaults do not provide a direct reason for the attack, let alone the resultant massacres. Our author does label the defenders ‘blasphemers’ and the like, but this is usually only done after Judas has commenced his siege. In this context it is difficult to blame any of the ‘surrounding nations’, rather what we could have is an indication of imperial ambition – a desire later realised, perhaps, with the Hasmonaean dynasty. At the very least we can understand these actions as plundering raids in order for Judas to finance his army.

On the other hand if we accept this relationship we have a demonstrable way to explain Judas’ campaign: he was responding to the actions of these officers. Interestingly, our author gives these officers Hellenic names thereby indicating that he understands them to be Seleucid officials.⁶² In this context, we can interpret the cited passage as indicating how the Seleucid officers continued to prevent the Jews from following their own customs or certain customs (perhaps owing to a central policy) despite the alleged settlements and to impose some Hellenic beliefs or practices that the Jews did not want to

⁶¹ To reiterate, this is an epitome, therefore we should expect some omissions. It may have been that any cause and effect relationship was common knowledge and/or that the need for brevity overrode this particular detail. This notwithstanding the relative positions in the text do indicate that the officers undertook an action (or actions) that resulted in a military response by Judas.

⁶² The phrase *ὁ κατὰ τόπον στρατηγός* has been interpreted by some as an official Seleucid rank: see Bringmann (1983) 61; contra. Bar-Kochva (1976) 85-93. Either way, there seems little doubt these officers were linked to the Seleucid regime – at least in the eyes of our author: see Goldstein (1983) 432-3. On our authors use of Hellenic names see Chapter Seven, below.

follow.⁶³ This fits well with the framework of the book as it continues a theme that our author had previously developed. Consider, for example, how this very scenario is outlined in Chapter Six: As part of royal policy ‘Hellenic’ residents of the surrounding cities were to prevent the Jews from following their traditional practices [II Macc. VI.8]. Understanding what occurred rests (and recognises) a reliance on internal cross referencing – a technique we know is used by our author. The same pattern is simply being repeated here.⁶⁴

While neither of these theories can be categorically dismissed, if we have to select one it is perhaps best to prefer the latter. This selection is based primarily on context. It supports a central theme that appears to be running through the whole of Second Maccabees: i.e. Hellenic influences in various forms are affecting Jewish society and are responsible, in part, for a degree of conflict. We are far better served continuing with the observations we have already demonstrated as being integral to the work as a whole. Be this as it may, our discussion and resulting conclusions are based on one reference. However, as we indicated the events at Kaspin are indicative of most of the other references, in that each follows the same basic pattern: Judas comes to the town, attacks it, and then destroys it (e.g. Charax [II Macc. XII.17ff]) or massacres the population (e.g.

⁶³ Whether or not interference by the ‘officers’ was Seleucid policy is left open by our author [Cf. Goldstein (1983) 432]. Even if the local officers were acting independently, their actions against the Jews will have involved an ‘Hellenic’ presence at some level. These officers were not the product of a vacuum and must have operated within the boundaries of what they knew: i.e. Hellenism. Therefore, even if it is only in an abstract way, Judas’ battles against the ‘Surrounding Nations’ are also against Hellenic concepts.

⁶⁴ II Macc. VI.8 demonstrates that the mistreatment of Jews by the inhabitants of local (i.e. surrounding) cities residing among them is a part of Seleucid policy. Furthermore, the campaigns of II Macc. IV and V are presented as a part or extension of the overall royal policy, while the implementation is carried out by the king’s kinsmen and/or local governors. This same ideology is evident in First Maccabees: Consider I Macc. V.1-2 which describes the surrounding nations’ mistreating the Jews in their respective cities. The author of First Maccabees also emphasises the negative role of the king’s policies and the imposition of Hellenic customs; see e.g. I Macc. I.20-24, 29-32, 41ff; II.22, 31, 34; III.13-14, 27ff esp. 32ff, 39, and 42.

Carnaim [II Macc. XII.26] and Ephron [II Macc. XII.27]). The rationale for the action on each comes back to the Hellenic officers that begin the Chapter, as indicated (above).

The one exception is in regard to the polis of Scythopolis.⁶⁵ Judas approaches with the intention of attacking, but the Jews in the city plead for leniency, testifying to the good will of the locals. As a result Judas spares the town on the condition that the inhabitants continue to maintain friendly relations with the Jews. This supports the assumption – previously based solely on the text of First Maccabees – that the peoples in the surrounding cities were mistreating the Jews who dwelt among them. The problem, however, still remains why the surrounding peoples acted as they did, a question that brings us back once more to the actions (policies) of the Hellenic officers. Therefore, the account of the sparing of Scythopolis, while perhaps at first seeming ‘different’, does not discredit our interpretation of the text. Finally, we should also acknowledge that the events at Scythopolis also enable our author to develop character depth: we are presented with the magnanimity of Judas – a man capable of ruthless slaughter and leniency as circumstances dictate.

This analysis of Chapter Twelve seems to militate against Judas’ main threat as coming from the ‘surrounding nations’ – at least in any independent sense. Certainly it cannot be disputed that the actual confrontation – in terms of the battles, sieges and the like – were fought on the lands in and around Judaea. Furthermore, it is also clear that the peoples Judas faced were, to some extent, those of the local cities. However, two observations in particular that arise from this case-study and our earlier analysis indicate that these interpretations must be treated with caution.

First, consider the empirical evidence that we have presented. In summary, there are 104 peoples and/or places mentioned in the text of Second Maccabees. Of these only

⁶⁵ II Macc. XII.29ff. This is the one example which is categorised as “Descriptive – Tending Positive” [II Macc. XII.30] in Table One at Appendix Two.

twenty-six can be categorised as negative or interpreted as involving some hostility toward the Jews. This number can be further reduced by removing all references to the 'Ἕλληνες or a specific Hellenic people (e.g. the Athenians) or place (e.g. Athens). In doing this we are left with ten entries, but only six of these refer to a 'surrounding nation' (or twelve if we include those references that we have classified as 'tending toward negative').⁶⁶ While we cannot reasonably suggest the number of hostile references correlates to our author's beliefs, it can provide both a direction for analysis and an indication of what could be (or might not be) important to our author. Consider how in Chapter Twelve seventeen of the nineteen references to 'peoples' are to those in the surrounding nations and correspondingly we are left with the impression that Judas' opponents were these cities. Therefore the empirical data supports a general reading of this chapter. If we extrapolate this methodology over the text as a whole, then the lack of hostile references to the surrounding nations must indicate a lesser role for these groups than some have advocated. Moreover, there are fewer negative 'surrounding nations' entries than references to 'Ἕλληνες or Hellenic places/peoples, which suggests (in terms of indicating patterns or assigning responsibilities) that the Hellenes are more central to the text than the surrounding nations.

This observation leads us to our second point: We have observed a developing link between the opponents of Judas and (in a very broad sense) 'Hellenic concepts'. This association is often identifiable through the personnel involved (i.e. their 'positions/roles'); the implementation of Seleucid policy (where 'things Seleucid' are understood or perceived to be Hellenic); and/or through a direct reference to 'Ἕλληνες

⁶⁶ Increasing the entries to include those that are classified as 'tending toward negative' also helps counter the subjective nature of the classification process: i.e. a reference we have classified as 'tending toward negative' someone else may see as 'negative'. Including them all as negative helps reduce such variations.

or a Greek people/place. Further support for this emerging trend can be found in the recognition that many of the local cities Judas confronts can and are classified as a Greek πόλις, which in itself indicates that the occupants were Hellenised.⁶⁷ Again the role of the Hellene seems to be very important for our author. Be that as it may, I am not advocating that we need to make a choice between ‘Hellenism’ and the ‘Surrounding Nations’ in order to clarify whom or what Judas is opposing. To do so simply reflects a need to quantify and qualify history into simple boxes or categories. The reality is that each of these reasons are not in themselves mutually exclusive. Disputes against the surrounding cities may be a reaction against or the result of Hellenic based policies. Citizens in these cities may have adopted foreign practices for self preservation, the Jews simply became the victims of such choices. Finally, it seems clear that while Judas was preoccupied with the king’s forces the traditional enemies of the Jews ravaged Judaea. When Judas was free he turned his attention to these incursions in order to secure territory and/or obtain booty. The important point to recognise is that regardless of whether or not these raids and counter-punches were independent actions our author understands them to be a part of the Seleucid campaigns and linked to a destructive Hellenic influence. This perception must surely have also been shared by many of his contemporaries.

Despite the detail of our analysis we are left with a sense that there are still many unanswered questions regarding Judas’ opponents and the role(s) of the ‘Hellene’, ‘Hellenism’, and/or ‘surrounding nations’. In an attempt to uncover further insights we will shift our focus and examine one of the more generic references to ‘other peoples’: ἔθνος. This is a term central to the phrase ‘surrounding nations’ itself as well as being important with regard to our earlier discussion on the ‘other’, therefore it requires further analysis.

⁶⁷ Consider, for example, Joppa and Jamnia. On their status as Greek cities see Goldstein (1983) 433; Tcherikover (1959) 93-94.

Chapter Six

The Use of ἔθνος In Second Maccabees

We have spent considerable time examining the groups, peoples and places that our author names in Second Maccabees. While interesting, this analysis does have limitations, one of which is the construction of narrow parameters: Our study has omitted any general labels to focus on the specific. As we have noted these entries are not insignificant in number, although we can assess the role of most of them with little difficulty – references to ‘the enemy’ are negative, while those to ‘Maccabaeus’ Men’ are always positive. The more general references to ‘foreigners’ or ‘masses’, however, do deserve our attention. This involves turning our attention once more to the ‘surrounding nations’ [τὰ ἔθνη τὰ κύκλω] or the terms more prevalent in Second Maccabees παμφύλων ἔθνη or τὰ ἔθνη.¹ In particular, we will address and try to answer the question: ‘to whom does the term ἔθνος refer’?

To begin ἔθνος, in its most basic form, can be defined as: ‘a number of people accustomed to live together’ or ‘a body of men’. By the time of Herodotus (at least) ἔθνος had come to mean ‘nation’ or a group that maintains local autonomy even while being subject to an empire.² There is also a clear relationship to the concept of ‘ethnicity’ (a term whose Greek root is ἔθνος), thereby raising the identity issues we have discussed extensively. Furthermore, ἔθνος in some ways incorporates the duality

¹ For παμφύλων ἔθνη see e.g. II Macc. VIII.9, VIII.16; or for τὰ ἔθνη (the nations / gentiles) see II Macc. VIII.5, XII.13 [I Macc. II.68; III.10, 45, 48, 52, 58; etc.]; see also Gruen (1998) 5.

² Consider, for example, how Herodotus divides the Hellenic race (γένος) into parts/nations/tribes (ἔθνη) [Hdt. I.143]. There has been and continues to be plenty of discussion on political structures in antiquity, and ἔθνη are fundamental to this. Consider, for example, an authorial comment by Polybius at the start of Book Nine where political entities are described as Cities, Nations and Monarchies [IX.1.4ff]; see also Diodorus XIX.57.3; O.G.I.S. 229, 1. II (Smyrnan decree). Note comments and references by Goldstein (1976) 194-5; Rostovtzeff (1941) 502-3, 1439-40; Walbank (1967) II.117. Finally see our comments and references in Chapter One n. 38, this thesis.

of ‘us’ and ‘them’: ἔθνος came to be used to describe ‘other’ groups. In the New Testament ἔθνος comes to represent non Jewish and non Christian peoples – that is ‘Gentiles’ – in an attempt to translate and interpret the Hebrew term *goyyim*. There is also the association or relationship between the terms ἔθνος, Latin ‘gens’ and ‘Gentiles’, all of which we have discussed in some detail elsewhere.³

While it is important to keep all of these various ideas and discussions in mind our principal concern at this point is the use our author makes of ἔθνος. To that end, our now familiar search of Second Maccabees reveals that ἔθνος is used twenty-five times. These references are tabulated below, along with an assessment as to whether each reference to ἔθνος is positive, negative or descriptive (from the perspective of our Jewish author); a short description of the context; and indicative translations.

Second Maccabees: ἔθνος⁴

Entry No	Reference	Pos/Neg/ Desc	Rev. Eng. Bible	Goldstein’s Commentary	Description
1	I.27	Neg	heathen	nations	Free those [Jews] who have been enslaved among the nations.
2	I.27	Neg	heathen	nations	
3	IV.35	Neg	other nations	other nationalities	Appears positive – describes how (<i>even</i>) the other nations

³ See our earlier discussion, especially in Chapter Two. See also Smith (1966) I.263-4; Tonkin et al. (1989) 13; Elcock (1960) 37.

⁴ To obtain the entries in this Table we have used the CD Rom: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (University of California, 1999), for searching. The column headings are reasonably self explanatory, but to avoid confusion: ‘Entry No’ – provides a running total of each entry. ‘Reference’ – the exact chapter and passage number from the text of Second Maccabees of each reference. ‘Pos/Neg/Desc.’ – classifying whether each entry is positive, negative, or descriptive from the perception of the Jews and based on the context of the surrounding passages. ‘Rev. Eng. Bible’ – the word chosen for the term ἔθνος by the translators for *The Revised English Bible With Apocrypha* (Oxford, Cambridge; 1989). ‘Goldstein’ – The term Goldstein chose to translate ἔθνος in his Commentary on Second Maccabees [Goldstein (1983) *passim*]. ‘Description’ – A brief description of most passages, providing context and additional comments. The two letters prefixed to the start of Second Maccabees are included.

					thought that the murder of Onias was wicked. It is a literary construction used to emphasise a point.
4	V.19	Desc	nation	nation	All three references in Chap. V are part of the explanation as to why God's wrath fell upon the Jews, the neglect and restoration of the sanctuary.
5	V.19	Desc	nation	nation	See V.19
6	V.20	Desc	nation	nation	See V.19
7	VI.4	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	Foreigners defiling the Temple, Greek connection.
8	VI.14	Desc [N]	other nations	other nations	Lord deals with other nations in different ways. Initially appears more favourable, but it is clear the Lord deals harshly with the other nations (saving up His wrath); while with the Jews He never deserts them and is constant with His discipline.
9	VI.31	Pos	countrymen	His nation	Eleazar's death an example to his countrymen.
10	VII.37	Desc[P]	His people	nation	Female martyr defiantly calls on God to show favour to His people quickly.
11	VIII.5	Desc[N]	Gentiles	Gentiles	Gentiles found Judas invincible, as God was now merciful. Link to profaning of Temple at VI.4

12	VIII.9	Neg	various nationalities	Gentiles of various stock	Nicanor's men sent to destroy Jews.
13	VIII.16	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	Gentiles are the enemy and are without cause.
14	X.4	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	Blasphemous and barbarous Gentiles.
15	X.8	Desc	nation	nation	Jewish nation should keep certain days holy.
16	XI.3	Desc[N]	Gentiles	other nation	The Temple to pay a tax like the shrines of all other nations – a link to plan to make Jerusalem a Greek city [XI.2].
17	XI.25	Pos	this nation	this nation	Letter to Lysias instructing that the Jewish nation be left to abide by its ancestral laws.
18	XI.27	Desc[P]	the people	the nation	Letter from the king to the Jewish people.
19	XII.13	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles (of very mixed stock)	Judas attacks Kaspin – a town with a mixed population of Gentiles.
20	XIII.11	Neg	Blasphemous Gentiles	Blasphemous Gentiles	Lord would not allow Jews [λαός] to fall to the Gentiles [ἔθνος] just when they had begun to revive.
21	XIV.14	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	Gentiles in Judaea flocked to join Nicanor.
22	XIV.15	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	Gentiles attack the Jews.
23	XIV.34	Pos	our nation	our people	Jewish priest prays to the constant champion of 'our people' – the Lord.

24	XV.8	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	The Gentiles were to attack ...
25	XV.10	Neg	Gentiles	Gentiles	Gentiles broke faith and perjured themselves.

The contents of this table raises several issues. First, consider (and compare) the indicative translations presented. Depending on the context of the passage(s) ἔθνος can be understood to mean ‘nation’ (whether it is the Jewish nation [II Macc. XI.25] or ‘other nations’ [II Macc. VI.14]); ‘people/countrymen’ [II Macc. VI.31]; or the most common translation: ‘Gentiles’ [II Macc. VIII.16]. To some extent this is a reflection of this era, with scribes struggling to translate Jewish texts into Greek or, at least, to distinguish adequately between the concepts represented by the Hebrew terms ‘*am*’ (‘us’, Jews) and *goy* (others, them). As we have seen the usual translation for ‘*am*’ was λαός, with our author very clear that it referred to the Jews.⁵ Based on this interpretation and use, we would expect to find that ἔθνος refers almost exclusively to the ‘other’ (i.e. the mirror of λαός referring to Jew). So it is perhaps a little surprising to find that this is not the case, although some explanation is provided by the recognition that *goy* (translated as ἔθνος) does on occasion refer to the Jews in the Old Testament.⁶ It is also possible that since we have a Jew writing in Greek (which would have probably been his second language) we should expect some complications as our author struggles with relative concepts. However, the subtle manipulation and use of the language that we have previously identified strongly militates against this possibility. We should accept that our author was in full control of his material.

⁵ For our discussion on λαός see Chapter Three.

⁶ In Deuteronomy [e.g. IV.6] we have *goy* placed in the mouths of foreigners with reference to Israel; while in Joshua [e.g. III.17] we have a narrative which, without any self-consciousness whatsoever, speaks of Israel as a *goy*.

With this observation made, let us look a little closer at our table and (in particular) the nine occasions that the Jews are the subject.⁷ Our first comment must be that some of these entries may not be the direct work of our author: Two, for example, are in letters that if genuine were written by another hand [II Macc. XI.25, 27]; while another two can be found in martyr stories that may be direct copies.⁸ Of course regardless of who originally wrote these sections of the text they were included (and possibly edited) by our author (at least), so we would still expect this use of ἔθνος to be understandable to the intended audience. Our comments, therefore, probably say more about our author's methodology than anything specific about the meaning of the term. It should also be apparent that our discussion has not accounted for all of the entries, so what else can we observe? One clear point, albeit contrary to some assertions is that both foreigners and the Jews themselves consider the Jews to be a nation [ἔθνος].⁹ Consider the actions of the priests in the Temple at Jerusalem who are responding to the threats of Nicanor:

Οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς προτείναντες τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπεκαλοῦντο τὸν διὰ παντὸς ὑπέρμαχον τοῦ ἔθνους ἡμῶν

The priests, stretching out their hands to Heaven, called upon Him who through all time has been the champion of our nation.

[II Macc. XIV.34]

⁷ II Macc. V.19, 19, 20; VI.31; VII.37; X.8; XI.25, 27; XIV.34.

⁸ The stories of Eleazar [II Macc. VI.31]; and the martyr mother and her seven sons [II Macc. VII.37]. These are both well known stories that our author may have copied directly from Jason (who, in turn, may have copied them from elsewhere), or our author may have found them in another source and inserted them here to prove a point. We can not make a definitive statement as to their origins. The letters in Chapter Eleven are generally accepted as genuine; see (especially) Habicht (1976) 12.

⁹ For the former see e.g. II Macc. XI.25. The Romans also refer to the Jews as a people, albeit using δῆμος not ἔθνος; Cf. II Macc. XI.34. For the later see cited passage below [II Macc. XIV.34]; other examples include II Macc. V.19 (twice), V.20; VI.31; VII.37; and X.8. Goldstein has suggested that the Jews consider themselves unprivileged 'for they do not call themselves a nation' [(1983) 141], these passages dispel this misconception.

Our author (himself a Jew), is referring to Jewish priests describing all Jews as an ἔθνος. Furthermore, there is a clear religious context here: it is God's people that are being called an ἔθνος. Considering the strong association between religion, λαός, and the Jews this word selection is surprising – we would have expected λαός to be used in this passage, not ἔθνος. There is no immediate explanation for this usage, although two points in particular are worth noting: First, ἔθνος may incorporate some attachment to a geographic area for the Jews (as well as to a 'people'). It may be that the meaning evolved this way owing to the diminishing geographic association inherent in Ἰουδαῖοι. This interpretation would help the reading of the three references in Chapter Five in particular [II Macc. V.19, 19, 20], so (despite the limited support from other passages) it should not be arbitrarily dismissed.

Second, and probably more likely, the use of ἔθνος by a Jewish author could indicate a degree of Greek influence. After all, the categorisation or labelling of a people in terms of city, nation and monarchy is a very Greek way of viewing the political world.¹⁰ Our Jewish author adopts this framework as part of the process of attempting construct his work in Greek – that is both the language and the thought processes needed to understand the language (i.e. 'Hellenism'). What we could have, therefore, is an example of the tension of a Jew trying to operate or live in an ever increasing 'Hellenic' world and consciously trying to adopt 'foreign' ideas while still 'being a Jew' (for want of a better way to describe his heritage and at the least inherent aspects of his way of life). To some extent this should not cause surprise; after all, as has been noted several times, we cannot escape the fact that our author was writing in Greek.¹¹ The living and moving between two worlds could result in the

¹⁰ As we have discussed earlier; see, for example, Polybius IX.1.4ff, and comments at n. 2, above.

¹¹ In addition our author can manipulate Greek ideology, he uses 'Barbarians' to refer to the Greeks, thereby taking a Greek idea and converting it to a Jewish perspective. The same can be said of our author's use of 'Hellenism' and 'Judaism' – both manipulating the Greek idea of 'medising'.

adoption of terms that do not quite fit the context of events or concepts intended, not through ignorance but rather the inherent complexities of the situation.

There is another dimension to our author's use of ἔθνος in relation to the Jews. The term is used in a very generic way in that it seems to be away of addressing all Jews everywhere regardless of which political, social or religious faction they belonged to. This is supported to some extent by the similar use of related terms (such as ὁμοεθνός, ὁμόγυλος), all of which seem to treat Jews as a homogenous group.¹² In Chapter Twelve, for example, Judas attacks Joppa when he heard how his fellow citizens [ὁμοεθνέω] had been brutally murdered by the city's inhabitants. The term seems to be more inclusive and used in order to gain the support of a wide range of readers, perhaps to justify Judas' actions (notice how in the actual description of the executions it is the Ἰουδαῖοι that suffer).¹³ Another example is how Judas defeated Nicanor for all his people/countrymen [ὁμοεθνός]; a response (perhaps) to how Jason had, many years earlier, imposed Hellenic customs on all Jews [ὁμόγυλος], not just those who supported his political ambitions.¹⁴ While interesting, in no way can we demonstrably prove this hypothesis: all we can acknowledge is that this interpretation appears to explain something of our author's use of ἔθνος. We can also recognise that this interpretation is consistent with a theme we have previously identified: An apparent desire to be all inclusive. After all, he often made descriptive statements referring, for example, to 'all the people of Judaea' [τὸ πᾶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ... γένος].¹⁵

Unfortunately, none of the points that we have raised can be described as definitive, a recognition which supports the complexity involved in analysing aspects

¹² Ὅμοεθνέω appears five times in the text all referring to the Jews [II Macc. IV.2; V.6; XII.5; XV.30, 31]; ὁμόγυλος appears once [II Macc. IV.10].

¹³ The use of ὁμοεθνέω is at II Macc. XII.5; the description of events at Joppa begins at XII.3ff.

¹⁴ For Judas' victory over Nicanor see II Macc. XV.30, 31. For Jason's imposition of Hellenic customs see II Macc. IV.10.

¹⁵ II Macc. VII.9; note also discussion in Chapter Two.

of Jewish society. Be that as it may (and the observations we have made notwithstanding), there are still some other general trends evident from our table. Most notably, while clearly ἔθνος can refer to 'Jews', it does in the majority of cases describe foreigners: Specifically, sixteen of the twenty-five [64 %] references are to non-Jewish peoples. This would suggest that using ἔθνος to refer to gentiles or others is the norm or intention (a reading consistent with Old Testament usage).¹⁶ This in turn brings us back to one of our original questions, exactly who are these 'Foreign Peoples' that our author is preoccupied with and what is his opinion of the ἔθνη?

Positive or Negative:

Beginning the Classification

Our tabulated categorisations indicate that over half – thirteen – of the references are classified as 'Negative', only three are 'Positive', while the rest are 'Descriptive'.¹⁷ All these classifications are made, of course, from a Jewish perspective so the negative entries tend to be derogatory descriptions of peoples or references to actions, such as the defiling of the Temple. Meanwhile the positive entries highlight conformity to Jewish traditions – so Eleazar refuses to adhere to the king's orders to eat meat (or even to pretend to eat meat), but (instead) strictly follows the law of God (and dies with dignity).¹⁸ All of these entries are relatively easy to categorise, except perhaps the reference to Onias' murder, that is until we realise that

¹⁶ Acceptance of this hypothesis is really just the acceptance of the traditional way of interpreting ἔθνος in Biblical Texts. Furthermore, as additional support, consider II Macc. XIII.11 where the Jews [λαός] are contrasted with 'Gentiles' [ἔθνος].

¹⁷ See above Table. Note that of the nine 'Descriptive' references three can be sub-classified as 'tending toward negative' [II Macc. VI.14; VIII.5; and XI.3] and another two as 'tending toward positive' [II Macc. VII.37; XI.27].

¹⁸ The example of Temple defilement can be found at II Macc. VI.4, another example of a derogatory description is II Macc. X.4: 'blasphemous and barbarous gentiles'. For the Eleazar story see II Macc. VI.31. The reference to ἔθνος is at the end of the story: 'So he died; and by his death he left a noble example and a memorial of virtue, not only to the young but also to the great mass of his *countrymen* [ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τοῦ ἔθνους]' – Emphasis added.

it is another example of what should now be a well recognisable *topos*: The apparent positive view of foreigners condemning Onias' murder is a literary exaggeration used to promote the status of Onias (marked by καί).¹⁹ The reality is, therefore, that (in this passage) the reference to the other nations is negative – in fact the more hostile the Jews perceive other nations (foreigners) to be the greater the status attributable to Onias.

With this passage explained, the remaining references can be easily classified into their appropriate category. In short, when ἔθνος is interpreted as negative the entry is without exception to foreigners (or perhaps more precisely to 'others'). Conversely, every reference to the Jews is positive [II Macc. VI.31; XI.25; XIV.34], tending toward positive [II Macc. VII.37; XI.27], or descriptive [II Macc. V.19, 19, 20; X.8]: none are negative). To a large extent this should not surprise. Second Maccabees does recount a 'nationalistic' revolt against a foreign overlord. In this context it stands to reason that Jewish representation would be positive. Moreover, the Jewish-positive and foreigner-negative assessment reinforces aspects of our earlier study where the world is divided into 'us' and 'them'. The context, therefore, indicates that we should understand ἔθνος as a boundary marker identifying acceptable and other practices/differences.

We can conclude this section, therefore, by recognising two clear points: First, for our author, ἔθνος tends to be used to represent people that are non-Jewish. Admittedly this usage is not as exclusive as we may have expected (or wanted), but it is still preferred by our author. Second, as we have just discussed, all foreigners (non Jewish ἔθνη) are perceived as negative. Let us keep this later observation in mind

¹⁹ This *topos* is discussed in detail in Chapter Four. The relevant passage for Onias' murder is II Macc. IV.34-5. Consider the relevant lines: As a result there was indignation and resentment at the unjust murder of the man not only among the Jews but even [καί] among *many of the other nations* as well '[Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν μόνον Ἰουδαῖοι, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ἐδείναζον καὶ ἐδυσφόρουν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀδίκῳ φόνῳ].

(and develop it further) as we discuss who these foreigners are and/or the concepts that we associate with them that give a negative perception.

Beyond A Boundary:

Who Are the (Foreign) ἔθνη in Second Maccabees?

This is a question that does not appear to have been specifically addressed by scholars. Rather it is simply acknowledged that many nationalities are referred to in the text and they are given the generic label ‘Gentiles’.²⁰ It is the generality of this translation – and therefore ἔθνος – that helps underpin the idea that Judas Maccabaeus actually confronted ‘the surrounding nations’ [τὰ ἔθνη τὰ κύκλῳ]. Certainly, when the relevant phrases are considered in isolation this theory appears to be entirely reasonable. However, a study of the specific people or common concepts that ἔθνος refers to is more revealing.

To that end we will return to our table and examine the sixteen occasions where ἔθνος refers to non-Jewish groups of people. Particular attention will be paid to the passages in the text that surround the individual references in order to make it clearer whether our author is referring to a specific group or if any underlying concept is regularly associated with the term. We will begin this assessment with a passage that was central to the Hellenic cross-referencing pattern we identified earlier. Nevertheless (and even at the risk of repetition) as this passage is particularly informative to our current analysis we will cite it here in some detail. Consider the relevant lines which begin Chapter Six:

Μετ’ οὐ πολὺν δὲ χρόνον ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς γέροντα Ἀθηναῖον, ἀναγκάζειν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους μεταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων, καὶ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ νόμοις μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι· μολῦναι δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις νεὼ καὶ προσονομάσαι Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου, καὶ τὸν ἐν Γαριζιν, καθὼς ἐτύγγανον οἱ τὸν τόπον οἰκοῦντες, Διὸς Ξενίου. Χαλεπὴ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὅλοις ἦν δυσχερὴς ἡ ἐπίτασις τῆς κακίας. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱερὸν ἀσωτίας καὶ κώμων ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπεπληροῦτο ῥαθυμούντων μεθ’ ἑταιρῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς περιβόλοις γυναιξὶ πλησιαζόντων, ἔτι δὲ τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα ἔνδον εἰσφερόντων.

²⁰ Tessa Rajak, for example, comments that no distinction is made by our author between Greek and Oriental: ‘Gentiles seem to be all as one’. Rajak (1990) 261-80; quote on Pp. 272. With regard to ‘gentiles’ as the accepted translation for ἔθνος consider the entries in our Table, above.

‘Not long after this the King [Antiochus IV] sent an elderly Athenian to compel the Jews to give up their ancestral laws and to stop living by the laws of God. He was also to defile both the temple in Jerusalem and the temple on Mount Gerizim and to proclaim the former to be the temple of Zeus Olympios and the latter to be the temple of Zeus Xenios, as requested by the local inhabitants. The execution of the wicked project brought suffering and indignation to all. For the ἔθνη had the temple filled with debauchery and revelry, as they lolled with prostitutes and had intercourse with women in the sacred courts and also brought forbidden things inside.’²¹

Our author’s concern here is with the immoral actions of the foreigners (‘gentiles’ [ἔθνη]) who have transgressed the ancestral laws of the Jews and the law of God. In a literal translation detached from the context of the first part of the cited passage ἔθνος here simply refers to foreigners or gentiles, anyone it seems who is not a Jew. However, the first part of the passage does provide some interesting details. We are told that the gentiles who defile the Temple were led by an Athenian and that they were sent to Judaea by King Antiochus [Μετ’ οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἐξάπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς γέροντα Ἀθηναῖον ἀναγκάζειν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ...]. This would suggest that some of the foreigners referred to accompanied the Athenian and/or were from the king’s court, so were demonstrably not from a surrounding nation. Furthermore, in the subsequent lines our author makes two things clear: First, the Athenian was to prevent the Jews from following their ancestral laws (a point our author describes in

²¹ II Macc. VI.1-4. Emphasis added. There are problems with translating this passage, the opening phrase: Μετ’ οὐ πολὺν δὲ χρόνον ἐξάπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς γέροντα Ἀθηναῖον ἀναγκάζειν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ... is particularly difficult. Reference could be being made here to either: ‘an elderly Athenian’ / ‘the Athenian elder’, or ‘the Athenian Geron’ / ‘Geron the Athenian’, or ‘the Athenian senator / official’, or even ‘the elderly Athenaeus. In short, the Greek is ambiguous and no definitive statement is possible – although I tend to think that the first [an elderly Athenian] is more likely. It also seems probable that our author is indicating that the Athenian was a member of the Council of the Areopagus in Athens, an organisation that he could equate to the Jewish Council of Elders. See Goldstein (1983) 271. For the opposing argument see Goldstein (1983) 270ff.

On the difficulties with ἐτύγχανον see Goldstein (1983) 273; Abel changes the reading to ἐνετύγχανον (1949) 360-361.

detail in the following chapters). Second, the Athenian is to defile the Temple.²² This is what the gentiles are described as doing with their debauched activity and the rededicating of the temples to Zeus Olympios and Zeus Xenios. Therefore, when considered in its entirety the interesting point for us is that there is a very clear Greek link here: the 'gentiles' were sent by an Hellenic king²³, the atrocities were led by a Hellene and the gentiles imposed Hellenic deities.²⁴ Furthermore, we then get a description of some of the practices that were then forced upon the Jews, such as having to partake in the feast for the king's monthly birthday celebration or to join in Dionysiac festivals.²⁵ As we have demonstrated previously these practices perceived

²² Antiochus' decision to use an Athenian to purge the Jews of their unacceptable religious practices is not unprecedented. Ptolemy I uses an Athenian (Timotheus) as a 'religious interpreter' to advise on how to revitalise the cult of Serapis. See Tac. *Hist.* IV.83; Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride* XXVIII; Chilver (1985) 85-6. Athens was seen as a Greek cultural and educational centre in Hellenistic times; see Goldstein (1983) 272.

²³ Either directly in that they accompanied the Athenian who was the king's representative; or indirectly in that they were 'recruited' and were followers of the king's policies (at least to some extent and regardless of what their personal motivations may have been for being present).

²⁴ Or they accepted a Greek name for their deity, a practice which was common in the East at this time. I do not agree with comments that such changes in addressing deities were insignificant (see e.g. Goldstein (1983) 273). Rather the adoption of a foreign name by locals at the expense of their own name does demonstrate a change, at the very least it indicates a shift in power. It is also symbolic of the acceptance (either as an individual or society) of new cultural practice – see Chapter Seven 'What Is In A Name?', below. Note, however (albeit at the risk of stating the obvious), that this is different from foreigners' equating a local deity to one of their own. The adoption of a foreign name for a deity (or even a person or a place) indicates either complete dominance by the outside group or widespread acceptance. The underlying issue to all this is the importance of language to culture. In short, the move to speak Greek undermines Jewish identity. Consider the story of the mother with her seven martyred sons: we are specifically told that they speak in their native language instead of Greek [II Macc. VII.1-42]. In this way a boundary and identity are emphasised.

²⁵ II Macc. VI.7. The association between Greek ideas and Dionysiac Festivals is self-evident. The celebrating of birthdays, however, is not something that we would immediately categorise as 'Greek'. It is clear that the Greeks (along with most peoples) had a method for measuring ages, but this is different from celebrating the anniversary of one's birth. Interestingly, according to Josephus, the Jews were forbidden from celebrating the birth of children, perhaps even birthdays [*Against Apion* II.204] – the reasoning being it would be a reason to drink to excess! At any rate, with regard to the Greeks, some evidence of a birth related monthly celebration for the Gods can be found in Hesiod [*Works and Days* 771; *Homeric Hymn* XIX]. Plautus' *Pseudolos* 165ff, itself based on a late Fourth Century B.C.E. Greek play, emphasises Ballio's birthday [For some general comments on Plautus' *Pseudolos* including translation and Bibliography see Willcock M.M. [Ed.] "Plautus: *Pseudolis*" (Bristol, 1987)

as being Hellenic (regardless of the reality) and are labelled as such a few lines later [II Macc. VI.8-9].

We can conclude, therefore, that there is a strong association between the Greeks (or at least Hellenic ideas and cultural practices) and the term Ἕθνος. This does not mean that we should translate or interpret Ἕθνος as ‘the Greeks’, rather the suggestion is that the Ἕθνη descending on the Temple were *seen* as Hellenised. This is an important point. In our cited passage the ethnicity (or geographic region of origin) is not specified. The atrocities may have been carried out by Syrians or Arabs or any of the surrounding nations yet our author focuses on the Hellenic component of these gentiles’ daily lives. What this suggests is that Hellenism is perceived as more of a threat than any specific people – Judaism’s enemy is the multitude of people who practise and impose Hellenic customs (the Ἕθνη of II Macc. VI.1-9).

Despite our enthusiastic assessment we are tempered somewhat by the recognition that these conclusions are based on a single passage that contains one reference to Ἕθνος.²⁶ Fortunately analysis of the remaining fifteen references demonstrates significant support. In Chapter Eight, for example, we receive a description of the start of the rebellion led by Judas Maccabaeus, a description that includes three uses of Ἕθνος. The third of these is most informative:

passim]. In the Hellenistic period birthdays seem to be celebrated to some extent – or, at least, there is more evidence supporting their recognition. See, e.g. The Rossetta Stone [*O.G.I.S.* 90. 46]; and Plutarch *Antony* 73. Now, this evidence also seems to suggest that there was a monthly birthday celebration for gods which was adopted by royalty in the successor (especially Ptolemaic) kingdoms. We can hypothesise that this was to emphasise the divine or semi-divine status of royalty. In this context it is plausible that the Jews viewed any royal birthday celebration as a religious festival. Therefore, partaking in such celebration could be understood as accepting a divine status for a royal or even a form of royal worship; both of which would of course be problematic. Furthermore, the appearance of such celebrations could be perceived as Hellenic by our author (regardless of whether they were or not), simply because they appear or the celebration of these dates becomes an issue under the Hellenistic monarchs (again especially the Ptolemies, but this passage [II Macc. VI.7] links it to the Seleucids as well).

²⁶ Although all of our discussions earlier in this thesis on related topics all tend to suggest a strong Hellenic influence or presence that the Jews had to address.

Συναγαγὼν δὲ ὁ Μακκαβαῖος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν ὄντας ἀριθμὸν ἑξακισχιλίους παρεκάλει μὴ καταπλαγῆναι τοῖς πολεμίοις μηδὲ εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν ἀδίκως παραγινομένων ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔθνῶν πολυπληθείαν, ἀγωνίσασθαι δὲ γενναίως, πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν λαβόντας τὴν ἀνόμως εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον συντετελεσμένην ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὕβριν καὶ τὸν τῆς ἐμπεπαιγμένης πόλεως αἰκισμόν, ἔτι δὲ τὴν τῆς προγονικῆς πολιτείας κατάλυσιν.

‘Gathering together his men, six thousand in number, Maccabaeus urged them not to be terrified by the enemy, or to take flight before the vast horde of ἔθνη unjustly coming against them, but to fight bravely; keeping before their eyes the outrages perpetrated on the Holy Temple in defiance of the law by them, the torments they inflicted on the city and the suppression of our ancestral traditions/laws’.²⁷

In this passage our author directly connects the gentiles faced by Judas Maccabaeus and his men with the outrages committed against the Jews, their beliefs and their Temple. When we continue our theme of reading the text as a continuum (as opposed to analysing isolated passages) it becomes clear that these outrages are those introduced at the start of Chapter Six and subsequently discussed in more detail in the chapters following.²⁸ Consider the detail: The ‘vast horde of gentiles’ [ἔθνῶν πολυπληθεία] opposing Judas is indisputably responsible for the ‘unjust acts’ described – the connection is directly made through the use of αὐτός.²⁹ Moreover, the ‘unjust acts’ are in themselves a clear allusion to what our author perceives as Hellenic practices. The two other references to ἔθνος in Book Eight reinforce this Hellenic association. The first of these passages is a description of the army which Ptolemy (the governor of Coele-Syria) sends against the Jews: ‘He [Nicanor, Ptolemy’s general] commanded no less than twenty thousand gentiles of various

²⁷ II Macc. VIII.16-17.

²⁸ The passage we are referring to, of course, is II Macc. VI.1-4. Cited in full above. The remainder of Chapter Six and Chapter Seven deal with specific atrocities as a result of following this policy; e.g. Eleazar [II Macc. VI.18-31], and the Mother with her seven sons [II Macc. VII.1-42].

²⁹ See the above citation – II Macc. VIII.16-17. The pronoun αὐτός [II Macc. VIII.17] clearly refers to the ‘vast horde of gentiles’ [ἔθνῶν πολυπληθεία] [II Macc. VIII.16], and by doing so connects the gentiles to the despicable acts.

stocks’.³⁰ When considering this passage in isolation it is clear (in fact directly stated) that the gentiles are from a variety of different backgrounds [παμφύλων ἔθνη]. However, look at all the additional descriptive details that our author provides: Each commander, for example, has a Greek name.³¹ Furthermore, they (explicitly commanders and through them the ἔθνη) are acting on behalf of the Seleucid king, Philip instructs Ptolemy ‘to come to the aid in concerns of the king’ [ἐπιβοηθεῖν τοῖς τοῦ βασιλέως πράγμασιν].³² Nicanor, the military commander, is the son of Patroclus who is a member of the order of the king’s friends; and Gorgias (a fellow commander) is an experienced general [II Macc. VIII.9]. The repeated Hellenic associations refine how we should read (translate) and understand ἔθνη.

The remaining reference in Book Eight continues to reinforce these observations, defining Judas’ enemy as those who have committed impious acts against Judaism [II Macc. VIII.5]. In this passage the gentiles are clearly those peoples responsible for the hostile acts described in the previous four passages [II Macc. VIII.1-4], which included blasphemous deeds and the defiling of the Temple – a clear allusion to the events described in Chapters Six and Seven (especially II Macc. VI.1ff). This, again, provides an underlying ‘Hellenic’ basis or characteristic inherent in the use of ἔθνη when referring to foreigners. This pattern is consistently repeated. In Chapter Ten [II Macc. X.1-4] the ‘blasphemous and barbarous gentiles’ [βλάσφημα καὶ βάρβαρα ἔθνη] from whom Judas recovers the Temple must be those who are described as defiling the Temple in Chapter Six [II Macc. VI.1ff].

All of these passages serve to emphasise the importance of the description of the violation of the Temple at the start of Chapter Six, which in turn indicates its

³⁰ II Macc. VIII.9: ὑποτάξας παμφύλων ἔθνη οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν δισμυρίων.

³¹ Ptolemy appoints Nicanor and Gorgias as commanders. See II Macc. VIII.9. For more on names as cultural indicators see discussion and references in Chapter Seven below.

³² II Macc. VIII.8.

central role in explaining (understanding) events described in the text. This process also raises two other points of note: First, how religion is fundamental (to our author) in determining Jewishness, or at least he is presenting the idea that transgressions against religion are detrimental to Jewish society and identity. Second, in addition to further demonstrating the cross referencing pattern we recognised earlier, our author also appears to be using repetition in order to reinforce who Judas' enemy was and, specifically, the role that Hellenic customs played in the threat to Judaism.³³

These points are consistently overlooked by commentators who tend to dissect the book and read sections in isolation. The reality is that through cross referencing and repetition our author is developing a complex array of layers that deliver subtle, but consistent, themes. In order to recognise, appreciate, and understand them Second Maccabees must be read as a whole.³⁴ The result is that ἔθνος, when it is used to refer to non-Jews, describes (more often than not) a combination of different ethnic groups all opposed to Judaism (e.g. soldiers) and united by a common acceptance of some Hellenic customs (something our author finds offensive). In a way this mirrors the use of ἔθνος when referring to Jews (as discussed earlier): Again the term incorporates a variety of different factions (albeit all Jewish) that are united by a shared identity, probably through a cultural bond (i.e. adherence to the Torah as opposed to Hellenic ideals for foreigners).

³³ Clearly both these points can be and often are combined (as is the case in the examples presented). Furthermore, repetition is a literary technique that is used by our author to emphasise themes that are important. To that end, consider how a hostile presentation of foreigners (based on religious concepts) is repeated extensively: Our gentiles are 'blasphemers' [II Macc. X.4], they destroy altars and temples [II Macc. VI.1-9; VIII.1-7; X.1-4]; etc. The idea that the gentiles' actions and presence is destroying the Jews' religion is reinforced by this repetition.

³⁴ In this context I am excluding the two prefixed letters since they are demonstrably written by different hands even if the author of the second letter may have been responsible for some minor editing of the main text. There are two references to ἔθνος in these letters, both of which refer to the 'heathen nations' that enslaved the Jews [II Macc. I.27]. The only Hellenic association possible here is by identifying these nations as the Ptolemies and Seleucids (a possibility reinforced by I Macc. I.1-10).

Be that as it may, not all the references to ἔθνος fit this pattern. In relation to foreigners there are still three passages that need to be discussed, all of which we have raised in different contexts before. We can begin with the passage in Chapter Six where a clear distinction is made between the Jews and *all* other nations.³⁵ While the ‘mixed’ element is present (many – ‘all’ – nations are referred to), the connection to Hellenism is more tentative. There is the mention of ‘sins’ [II Macc. VI.14], which owing to the position of this passage immediately following the defilement of the Temple by an Athenian (and on orders from Antiochus) [II Macc. VI.1ff] could imply a direct association, but nothing definitive. Of course, the mention of sins could be a standard societal or literary association: gentiles were expected to be sinful. Regardless, this usage and these interpretations at the least do not discredit our previous observations.

The second exception is similar: Judas advances against Kaspin which we are told was inhabited by a very mixed Gentile population [παμμειγέσιν ἔθνεσιν].³⁶ There seems little doubt that the description is intended to be derogatory, playing on older beliefs on the excellence of racial purity: ‘we’ are better than ‘they’. This gives the passage a social purpose that still undermines foreigners even if not through a direct link to Hellenism – although (again) there is still a tentative association. Kaspin is one town in a series of places attacked by Judas. Most, such as Joppa and Jamnia, are recognised as Greek πόλεις.³⁷ While the categorisation of Kaspin itself is less

³⁵ II Macc. VI.14: ‘With the other nations the Lord waits patiently, until he can punish them when they have attained the full measure of their sins. Quite otherwise is his decree for us’ [Οὐ γὰρ καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ἀναμένει μακροθυμῶν ὁ δεσπότης μέχρι τοῦ καταντήσαντας αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἐκπλήρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν κολάσαι, οὕτως καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν ἔκρινεν εἶναι]. For our previous analysis of this passage see Chapter Two.

³⁶ II Macc. XII. 13. For a previous discussion on this passage (including translation problems) see Chapter Five.

³⁷ See II Macc. XII.1-9. On Jamnia and Joppa as Greek cities see Goldstein (1983) 433; Tcherikover (1959) 93-4. See also comments by Jones (1940) esp. 80-1; Jones A.H.M. *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* Second Edition (Oxford, 1971) Chapter Ten; Applebaum (1975) 59-73.

certain we can infer a subjective association – all the cities are part of the same narrative. Therefore, if hostility is directed against the Greek cities in part because of a Hellenic link, Kaspin could be either seen as another πόλις or tainted by association.

The third exception arises from the murder of Onias, a passage we have discussed in great detail, recognising the inherent literary exaggeration: ‘*even* the other nations supported the Jews’ [II Macc. IV.35]. Be that as it may, in our current discussion the ἔθνη referred to (1) include a variety of different peoples; and (2) an interesting (possible) Hellenic connection if we develop our analysis a little bit more. Consider the lines following our passage where our author continues with the same theme: foreign support is again professed against the ‘wicked murderers’ of Onias. Curiously though, the reference to ἔθνη has now gone and in its place we find ‘the Greeks’ [Ἑλλήνες].³⁸ Again the construction of literary exaggeration is apparent, but our interest is with the clear repetition of subject matter. It almost appears that the two terms – ἔθνη and Ἑλλήνες – could be interchangeable (although this is not an argument that I am advocating). Certainly, the evidence based on this passage alone is tentative at best, but it does gain some traction when considered as a component of the societal viewpoint that seems to be emerging from our analysis as a whole.³⁹ Furthermore, and finally, we can conclude that these three exceptions are not labelled as such because of no Greek connection, but rather because the association is significantly weaker than that of the other references. In themselves they in no way

³⁸ II Macc. IV.36: ‘With the king’s return from the Cilician region, the Jews in the city [Antioch], with support against such wickedness from even the Greeks, appealed to him concerning Onias’ unjustified killing’ [Τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπανελθόντος ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ Κιλικίαν τόπων, ἐνετύγχανον οἱ κατὰ πόλιν Ἰουδαῖοι, συμμισησπονηρούντων καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρὰ λόγον τὸν Ὀνίαν ἀπεκτόνησαν].

³⁹ Or, if we want to pursue the literary perspective, we could suggest that in the second part of the passage (II Macc. IV.37) our author increases the degree of emphasis by using the Greeks as the comparative instead of the other nations. This would imply that while foreigners were ‘bad’ the Greeks were the worst – something that is not out of context with the rest of our study.

discredit the pervasive Hellenic presence that seems to be associated with our author's perceptions of Judas' enemies.

* * *

We are now in a position to bring together several points that we have raised in this and preceding chapters. First, we have identified that the Jews' traditional way of life was under threat.⁴⁰ We then attempted to identify exactly who posed this threat: Are Judas' opponents best described as the 'surrounding nations'? In short, our analysis of specific peoples began to suggest that this view is doubtful, while the discussion of our author's use of ἔθνος continued to question the significance of local people being Judas' primary concern. This does not mean that the peoples of the surrounding nations played no role for their geographic proximity meant that they were involved in the conflicts. However (and this is the fundamental point), they are identified as the enemy not because of who they were, but because of the direct Hellenic associations or the subtle indirect cross-referencing to things Hellenic and/or to the Hellenes.

We can take this analysis one stage further by also recalling our previous discussion of identity. Our study has demonstrated that in Second Maccabees ἔθνος is not used to refer to any specific people (apart from the Jews). References to other nations are always understood in a more general sense: ἔθνος describes 'other peoples' or 'Gentiles', not, say, the Syrians or the Phoenicians specifically. This interpretation of ἔθνος can be understood as reflecting Jewish (and Greek) segregation of the world into 'us' and 'them', where the latter group is not a specific people but simply anyone else who is not defined as 'us'. This is of interest as the criteria for categorisation into 'us' and 'them' (or specifically Jew and Gentile) appear

⁴⁰ The notion that the Jews were in some way defending Judaism is mentioned several times in this paper: see the Introduction, Chapter Three and Chapter Eight. See also Gruen (1998) 4; and Second Maccabees itself, where the supporters of Judas Maccabaeus are reported as fighting 'on behalf of Judaism' ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ [II Macc. II.21].

to be based on certain aspects of daily life: The Jews do things one way, the others (gentiles) another. This reinforces our earlier study where we observed that 'way of life' had become a principal way of identifying who someone was or perhaps more accurately in identifying the group to which someone could be assigned. Now, in our discussion on ἔθνος the common elements of the gentiles' way of life that are used by our author to classify and identify 'them' as being opposed to the Jews happen to be Hellenic. In this way there is a distinction drawn between 'Hellenism' and 'Judaism', and it can be argued that they are, to some extent and in certain conditions, represented in a juxtaposition. In Chapter Eight this is very clear: the enemy of Judas (and Judaism) are blaspheming and impious (Hellenic) defilers of the Temple, identifiable as those from the start of Chapter Six.⁴¹

As a result of this assessment, the attacks on the Jewish way of life and instigation of policies forbidding the Jews to follow ancestral laws can be understood in a different way. It would seem that the Jews connected foreign interference in their cultural practices with aspects of an Hellenic way of life. This Greek association, in turn, tends to be highlighted in our text, as it is an identifiable factor amongst the aggressors against which opposition can be rallied. Moreover, the threat was most noticeable against Jewish religious beliefs and customs – important components of Jewish identity. It is little wonder that a rebellion resulted.

There is, however, a final word of caution. To some extent this opposition to Greek ways is arbitrary. Not everything Hellenic was shunned. Greek views were simply the predominating common factor amongst diverse groups of people that surrounded the Jews or whom the Jews were brought into contact with as a result of Alexander's conquests and the subsequent empires that were established.⁴² We could

⁴¹ A point that has recently been dismissed by Gruen (1998) 4ff. We should also stress (if it is not clear from our argument) that this recognition does not presuppose a cultural crusade.

⁴² A point perhaps alluded to by the author of First Maccabees when he provides a brief history of events that preceded the Maccabean rebellion. See I Macc. I.1-10.

almost view the anti-Greek sentiment as being developed in the text as propaganda: a way to identify foreigners and opponents, something to rally against. Yet the point is that even while we are identifying these underlying themes, perhaps subconscious beliefs, we must constantly remind ourselves that Judas Maccabaeus and his supporters did not act because of a loathing of Hellenism but by the need to defend Judaism. Things Hellenic are just a way to label opponents and a concept for the Jews to rally against. The strength of this theory is not in the individual examples that we have discussed (some of which are acknowledged as tenuous), but in the constant and consistent negative association. This is a perception we will now go on to confirm from a slightly different perspective: our author's choice of names and the actions he applies to Greek and Jewish named individuals.

Part Three
From Perception to Reality:
Judaism and Hellenism in Second Maccabees

* * *

Chapter Seven
What is in a Name?¹

When we reflect upon our discussion of Second Maccabees it becomes clear that we have been analysing a boundary or, to put it more simply, the representation by this text of the relationship between Jew and Greek / Hellenism and Judaism. In this context our investigation and resulting observations are no different from the scholarship which precedes it. Scholars have read and interpreted, re-read and re-interpreted these books in terms of Jewish acceptance or rejection of a pervasive Hellenistic culture.² Be that as it may, there is one distinct difference between earlier efforts and our study: the methodology. To be specific, the Hellenic associations we have identified are indirect, revealed (to use the jargon we introduced earlier) in the subjective elements of the text as opposed to the objective ones.³ There is, for example, no direct statement to indicate that

¹ A draft version of this chapter was presented at the Joint Classical Association Conference at the University of Edinburgh, 4-7 April 2002. It was also kindly read and commented on by Prof. Erich Gruen. Any mistakes, of course, remain my own.

² Made explicitly clear on several occasions in this thesis. Recall our Introduction where we cited Erich Gruen's opening sentence in his book *Heritage and Hellenism*, a citation that is worth reiterating here: 'The revolt of Judas Maccabaeus represents for most researchers the pivotal point in the confrontation of Judaism and Hellenism.' [Gruen (1998) 1]; recall also Jonathan Goldstein's more general comment in his opening statement to an article on Jews and Hellenism, an article in which Judas Maccabaeus' rebellion is central: ' "The Greek confronted the Hebrew. Judaism confronted Hellenism." Thus runs the conventional wisdom of our time' [Goldstein (1981) 64-87, 318-326]. The point, I think, is well demonstrated.

³ A point emphasised in several preceding Chapters and in the Introduction to this thesis. Note also comments by Rajak (2001) 3-10, esp. 6.

the enemy of the Jewish people are the Greeks or even Hellenism itself.⁴ All the text seems to make clear is that Judas Maccabaeus raises his standard in defence of Judaism. This notwithstanding, it is also indisputable that our discussions on the 'other', be it through the analysis of terms such as ἔθνος or even the various non-Greek peoples named by our author, have resulted in the identification of a possible, negative, Hellenic connection. The threat to Judaism demonstrably returns to Hellenic concepts, policies and/or institutions.

To an extent our study and tentative conclusions can be explained by the general events that were occurring at this time. There is, after all, a reason this era is referred to as the Hellenistic period: a degree of Hellenic association is to be expected.⁵ In no way does our discussion attempt to dispute this. What we are trying to identify is the extent of Hellenisation (or boundaries between Judaism/Hellenism, Greek/Jew) and gather some insights into Jewish societal perceptions. Therefore, it is not just the widespread presence of Hellenic concepts that is important, but the consistency in how things Greek are treated, understood, and approached (read 'perceived') by our author. To this end, the negative Greek elements perceived to be present amongst Judas' opponents and the regular connections indicating that Hellenic policy and politics are a threat to Judaism all suggest that we should treat with caution theories that dismiss cultural conflict.

⁴ Excepting, perhaps, the labelling of Antiochus Epiphanes and his son, Eupator, as enemies [II Macc. 20ff], if we accept that the Seleucid King was perceived as Hellenic (cf. Introduction).

⁵ So Hengel: 'From about the middle of the third century B.C. *all Judaism* must really be designated *Hellenistic Judaism* in the strict sense' [Hengel (1974) 104]. See also the opening statement in Applebaum's paper: 'The influence of Greek Culture on Jewish Life in this country [Judaea] in the Second Temple Period and subsequently is today an accepted fact' [Applebaum S. 'Jewish Urban Communities And Greek Influences' In *Scripta Classica Israelica* Vol. 5 (1979/80) 158-77, quote 158]; and note, especially, Smith (1956) 67-81. This thesis is not universally accepted, however, see Feldman (1993) *passim* esp. 3-83; and Millar (1978) 1-21; (1987) 110-133.

In order to reinforce our observations and in an attempt to demonstrate how subtle but pervasive this cultural threat could be, or more precisely could be perceived to be, let us continue to explore our author's opinion of the Greeks. To do so we will turn our attention to an examination of the actions of the characters in Second Maccabees. In this study we will try to identify repeated character traits that both appear in different historical and/or fictional stories, and are repeated regardless of the requirements dictated by different literary constructs. It seems reasonable to assume that any such repeated character traits are representative of our author's perceptions.

What Is In A Name?

With this in mind, let us begin our analysis. For simplicity's sake, and because they were not written or attached to the book itself by our author, we will, for this study, leave aside the two attached letters at the start of the book. This still leaves a total of seventy-eight characters for us to examine, all of which are tabulated in Appendix Three.⁶ The table also details, wherever possible, the ethnicity of the named person and the ethnic origin of his/her name. Furthermore, the actions of each character are assessed – from the

⁶ In addition to the list at Appendix Three there are two other possible characters that have been omitted from our study since there is uncertainty as to whether they are named or not. The first is at II Macc. X.11 (the passage is translated in full below, cf. n. 11 and text; this Chapter) where we find the label 'Protarchos', which could be either a name or part of a title held by Lysias, see Goldstein (1983) 387ff who is confident it is a name. However, Goldstein's arguments are not that persuasive: there does not need to be a καὶ ... δὲ ... construction for στρατηγὸς πρόταρχος to be translated as 'first-ranking governor'; there is also a precedent for this title elsewhere [cf. *Inscriptiones Graecae* XII [5] 724]. Moreover, the Latin and Syriac versions of the text clearly understood this term as a title – a deceptively important point when in Goldstein's own words the chief value of the Syriac version 'lies in showing how an ancient reader understood the Greek' [(1983) 127]. At any rate, the entry is purely descriptive and does not alter the study in any way. The second uncertain name occurs at II Macc. VI.1 where Antiochus sends either an 'elderly' Athenian or an Athenian named 'Geron' or even 'the elderly Athenaeus' to compel the Jews to abandon their laws. Goldstein takes the Athenian to be named 'Geron' [cf. Goldstein (1983) 270ff], but there is too much uncertainty (see our previous discussion on this passage in Chapter Six n. 21). As a result we will leave him unnamed for this study, although we should note that including him would support our argument.

perspective of a pious Jew – as positive, negative, or descriptive. The relevance of these various entries will become apparent as our discussion develops.

Now, of the seventy-eight named characters our interest is with those that undertake an action that we can categorise. The premise is that actions involve a choice by our author in terms of how he chooses to describe or represent whatever a character does. Of course there are restrictions which do limit our author's creativity – such as literary conventions, historical facts, and the like – but there is also a certain degree of flexibility. To this end, therefore, we can label twelve characters as purely descriptive. That is they are nothing more than the mention of an actor's father or reference to a character from Biblical history; so, in short, they are of little value to our study.⁷ This notwithstanding, the one notable name that we have categorised as descriptive – and a choice that does require some explanation – is that of Jason of Cyrene. Now, Jason is only known to us from this text, where he is mentioned once and described as the author of a history in five books which our author will summarise.⁸ While we could make a case for a positive classification for Jason based on the pro-Jewish content of Second Maccabees, our methodology prevents it. We are interpreting the perceptions of Jason's abridger – he either manipulated the text or chose to copy directly Jason's account of events. The record as presented is what our author wanted us to read, not what Jason wrote: we can only guess at what is original and what is interpretation. Therefore, from

⁷ Consider for example Thraseus at II Macc. III.5, who is simply the father of Apollonius [... ἦλθεν πρὸς Ἀπολλώνιον Θρασαίου ...]. Other examples include: II Macc. III.11; IV.4, 45; VIII.9; XII.2. Biblical and Historical descriptive references include: II Macc. VII.7; VIII.19; XV.14, 22. The remaining two descriptive references are to Jason of Cyrene (II Macc. II.23, and see discussion above) and Ptolemy Philometer (II Macc. IV.21); see Appendix Three.

⁸ The passage is II Macc. II.23. On Jason of Cyrene see especially: Schmidt (1973) I.19-20; (1986) III.531-537; Eissfeldt (1966) 580ff; Abel (1949) xlii ff.; Hengel (1974); Goldstein (1983) 4-5, 19ff; Pfeiffer R.H. *The History of New Testament Times* (New York, 1949) 506-18; Tcherikover (1970) 381-90, esp. 386-7. See also discussion and references in the Introduction to this thesis.

our author's perspective and as it is presented to us, Jason of Cyrene is only a name mentioned in passing to describe or acknowledge the work upon which Second Maccabees is based.

Removing these twelve references still leaves us with sixty-six named actors whose characteristics (actions) we can assess. We will begin by categorising the ethnicity of the individuals presented. As part of this process we will list as Greek those individuals who probably are Greek even though we cannot be certain of their origins, as well as those who are ranged with the Seleucids regardless of their actual origins (race), just as long as they are not Jewish.⁹ The process is reversed for the Jews. The result of the analysis is that thirty-four of the sixty-six actors are Greek or are part of the Seleucid hierarchical structure; twenty-nine are Jewish or are ranged with the Jews; and two are Roman. Finally, there is at least one named Arab.¹⁰ In themselves these figures tell us very little, other than that roughly half of the characters in Second Maccabees are Greek, while the other half are virtually all Jewish. Fortunately the group sizes should enable us to obtain worthwhile insights and determine if there are any patterns in their respective actions and names. The roughly even sizes will also help in any comparative discussions. With this breakdown made, therefore, let us look, first, at those characters that we have classified as Greek.

⁹ This classification is based upon our discussion in the Introduction where we defined the Seleucids as Hellenic (in a broad sense). Quite clearly it is necessary for Jewish actors to have their own category.

¹⁰ The named Arab is Aretas [II Macc. V.8.]. There is also one other character with what is probably an Arabic name, Auranus [Cf. II Macc. IV.40]; although this name is carried by the Hasmonaean family (hence the listing of this individual as a 'Jew#'). Finally, we have an individual with an Iranian name [Rhodocus: XIII.21], whose ethnicity we have classified as 'Jew#' since he fought in the Jewish army (before he betrayed them!). We should also mention once again that in this study Macedonians are categorised as Greeks. See Appendix Three.

As these numbers can get confusing, attached as Appendix Four is a flowchart. The chart gives the breakdown that has just been presented and should help with the decipherment of the arguments we will develop.

As Second Maccabees recounts a Jewish rebellion against the Seleucids (their Hellenic overlords) we would expect to categorise most of the Greek characters as negative. This is exactly what we find, with (perhaps) the only surprise being the proportion of hostile Greeks – there is only one Greek character that, at some point in the text, does not oppose the Jews and/or Judaism. Moreover, the one exception – Ptolemaeus Macron, a governor of Syria and Phoenicia – is very clearly portrayed as an outcast in the Greek world. Consider the account we are presented with:

Οὗτος γὰρ παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν, ἀνέδειξεν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων Λυσίαν τινά, Κοίλης δὲ Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης στρατηγὸν πρῶταρχον. Πτολεμαῖος γὰρ ὁ καλούμενος Μάκρων τὸ δίκαιον συντηρεῖν προηγούμενος πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους διὰ τὴν γεγνηκυῖαν εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀδικίαν, ἐπειρᾶτο τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰρηνικῶς διεξάγειν. ὅθεν κατηγορούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων πρὸς τὸν Εὐπάτορα, καὶ προδότης παρ' ἑκάστα ἀκούων, διὰ τὸ τὴν Κύπρον ἐμπιστευθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλομήτορος ἐκλιπεῖν καὶ πρὸς Ἀντίοχον τὸν Ἐπιφανῆ ἀναχωρῆσαι, μήτε εὐγενῆ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εὐγενίσας, φαρμακεύσας ἑαυτὸν ἐξέλειπεν τὸν βίον.

Upon ascending to the kingship, he [i.e. Eupator] appointed a certain Lysias regent and chief governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. For Ptolemaeus surnamed Makron [the former governor] attempted to preserve justice, speaking out on behalf of the Jews because injustices had been done against them. He would continually attempt to administer them in a peaceful way. As a result he was denounced by the [king's] Courtiers to Eupator. Hearing from every direction that he was a traitor because he had deserted Cyprus, entrusted to him by Philometer, and had gone over to Antiochus Epiphanes, although he held a noble position, he did not receive respect, so he abandoned his own life having taken poison.¹¹

¹¹ II Macc. X.11-13. This passage contains a couple of phrases where the Greek is uncertain (cf. comments by Abel (1949) 409ff, Goldstein (1983) 387ff). As a result in several places when translating I have had to present what is probably meant rather than a stricter literal version. Two areas of concern, in particular, must be mentioned: First, there is Lysias' position and the question as to whether πρῶταρχος refers to a title or name, a point mentioned above (see n. 6); see also Goldstein (1983) 387ff. Second, there is the phrase: '...μήτε εὐγενῆ τὴν ἐξουσίαν εὐγενίσας, φαρμακεύσας ἑαυτὸν ἐξέλειπεν τὸν βίον...' [II Macc. X.13]. The last part is relatively straightforward, essentially Ptolemaeus killed himself by taking poison. The first part, however, is very confusing. Goldstein leaves the section un-translated, alleging that the text is corrupt. The difficulty is with the verb after the negative (μήτε), located at the start of the last line in the passage as it is cited above, namely: εὐγενίσας. At this point Codex Alexandrinus has εὐγεννασίας, while Codex Venetus has εὐγεννασίας; words unknown elsewhere in Greek and of which no sense can be made.

Our author makes it clear that Ptolemaeus attempts to maintain amicable relations with the Jewish people.¹² For his efforts, however, he was denounced to the king and labelled a traitor. Our author links both accusations (i.e. of his treatment of the Jews and desertion of Philometer) through their juxtapositions. In this way our author connects the positive acts towards the Jews with the betrayal of a king and, ultimately, untrustworthiness. Therefore, it is both these accusations that undermine Ptolemaeus' position and isolate him to the extent that he commits suicide. This series of events presents Ptolemaeus as anything but a convincing champion of the Jewish cause.¹³ In fact the failure and downfall of this character helps reinforce the negativity our author associates with all the other Greek actors. Ptolemaeus cannot and is not permitted to support the Jews successfully. To use a cliché, this character is the exception that helps prove the rule.

There are other possibilities for the positive classification of Greek characters. Most notably we have the description of how the early Hellenic kings are deemed to have held the sanctuary in honour and bestowed magnificent gifts on the Temple, especially

Assuming a root of *ευ-γεν* Grimm has restored *εὐγενίσας*, which is what we read in Rahlfs' edition. The Latin versions of the text simply omit the problem - it seems it is too difficult. See discussion and conjecture in Abel (1949) 410; Goldstein (1983) 388-9. Regardless of the problems with the text what appears to be meant (and how we will interpret the passage) is that: 'he [Ptolemaeus] still held nobility [albeit in terms of the office/position or perhaps power], but was not noble [in terms of not having any credibility or respect within the Seleucid hierarchy]'. Finally note that *Φίλοι* 'friends' is an official Seleucid rank and has been translated as 'Courtiers' to emphasise this fact.

¹² To be clear, this is not the same Ptolemaeus that can be found at II Macc. IV.45, and VIII.9. See Mitford T.B. 'Ptolemy Macron' In *Studi in onore de Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni* (Milano: Ceschina, 1957) 163-87; Goldstein (1983) 388.

¹³ Ptolemaeus is clearly presented as weak-willed, ineffective and untrustworthy, and this proves our point. This notwithstanding, there is also a political side to Ptolemaeus Macron's isolation and demise as he seems to have sided with Antiochus IV against Ptolemy Philometer: Cf. Goldstein (1983) 388. For more on pro-Ptolemaic and pro-Seleucid factions in Jewish politics at this time, see e.g. Schäfer (2003) 27-51.

Seleucus IV who apparently met the whole cost of a sacrifice from his own revenues. This is of course misleading as the passage should now be well recognisable as a part of our literary construction where apparent positive exaggeration belies the true negative perception.¹⁴ Be that as it may, this study also reveals another literary element inherent in these characters. It appears that any benevolence which could be inferred from ‘good deeds’ is put into perspective (reality) by subsequent acts: So Seleucus IV sends Heliodorus to remove the Temple’s treasures [II Macc. III.7ff]; or Nicanor (after befriending Judas) turns arrogant and hostile [II Macc. XIV.18-28]. The presentation of their true characteristics allows our author to demonstrate how the opponents of Judaism are wicked and how the Lord can and does punish them (at the hands of Judas, of course).¹⁵ There can be little doubt, therefore, that the Greeks are consistently portrayed in a negative way by our author.

By way of contrast, of the twenty-nine Jews identified just over half – fifteen – are opposed to Judas or do something that betrays or harms the Jews.¹⁶ It seems,

¹⁴ II Macc. III.2-3: ‘In fact, *even* Seleucus the King of Asia provided the whole cost of the sacrificial worship out of his own revenues’ [ὥστε καὶ Σέλευκον τὸν τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλέα χορηγεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας τῶν θυσιῶν ἐπιβάλλοντα δαπανήματα: II Macc. III.3]. See our discussion on this passage and the literary construction in Chapters Three and Four.

¹⁵ This latter patterning also supports our initial literary construction by demonstrating that these so called ‘positive’ characters (foreigners) were recognised as being hostile to the Jews. It is also possible that we may have a literary pattern corresponding to the Homeric themes: Cf. the work of Milman Parry. See in particular his review of Walter Arend, ‘Die typischen Scenen bei Homer’ In *Clas Phil* 31 (1936) 357-60; reprinted in Parry A. [Ed.] *The Making of Homeric Verse: The collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford, 1971) 404-7. See also, e.g. Lord A.B. *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, 1960) esp. 68ff; and *The Singer Resumes His Tales* M.L. Lord [Ed.] (Cornell, 1995); Slatkin L.M. ‘Composition by Theme and the “Metis” of the Odyssey’. In S.L. Schein [Ed.] *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretative Essays* (Princeton, 1996) 223-237, esp. 225ff ; and the discussion by Thomas on the Lord-Parry thesis: Thomas R. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992) 31ff).

¹⁶ Specifically, II Macc. III.4, 11: IV.7, 23, 29, 40; VIII.22; XII.19, 19, 35; XIII.21; XIV.3, 19, 19, 19. See Appendix Three.

therefore, that while Greeks are unanimous in their opposition to Jews and/or Judaism, Jews themselves are divided in their support. Our author directly reinforces this observation at various stages in the text as he breaks Jewish society up into different groups. Menelaus, for example, is described as having established himself as a great plotter against his fellow citizens [μέγας τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπίβουλος καθεστώς].¹⁷ He (Menelaus) is one of several individuals labelled in this way (i.e. as hostile to their fellow Jews).¹⁸ There is also the introduction of the group called the *Antiochenes* and, although they are on Judas' side, there is the mention of a Jewish group called the Hasidim.¹⁹ All these examples clearly demonstrate the segmentation of Jewish society, thereby reinforcing an interpretation we have already ascribed to our author: His desire (at times) to be clear that he is addressing *all* the Jews.²⁰

Finally, based on the figures we have presented, the only other observation that we can make which is of some interest is that the majority of the characters – forty-eight of the sixty-six that we have identified as undertaking some form of action – are depicted in a negative way. There is nothing definitive that this observation helps us with, except that it – along with the other figures we have mentioned, above – does reinforce the widely accepted context of the work, i.e. that our author believed that the world was against the Jews and that many of his countrymen had forsaken the traditional ways. This,

¹⁷ II Macc IV.50.

¹⁸ See, e.g. Jason at II Macc. V.6, 8.

¹⁹ See respectively: II Macc. IV.9 (*Antiochenes*); and II Macc. XIV.6 (Hasidim). Consider also II Macc. XV.2 where our author makes it clear that there were Jewish forces with Nicanor when he advanced against Judas. This is by no means an exhaustive list, rather it is very much demonstrative only.

²⁰ E.g., Onias who is explicitly described as being concerned for *all* his fellow citizens: 'He [Onias] went to the king to set things in order. He did not intend to make accusations against his fellow citizens, but to look after the interests of all both as individuals and collectively' [πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα διεκομίσθη, οὐ γινόμενος τῶν πολιτῶν κατήγορος, τὸ δὲ σύμφορον κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν παντὶ τῷ πλήθει σκοπῶν: II Macc. IV.5].

at the very least, does demonstrate that our methodology is of some use and can confirm existing theories derived from Second Maccabees.

This observation notwithstanding, it is our intention to improve our understanding of the text. To that end, let us cross reference the observations we have made up to now with the ethnic origin of each character's name. The premise here is that while it may be difficult to identify the 'ethnicity' of individuals, a person's name is a clearer indicator of where one's sympathies or origins could lie. Moreover, the naming of a character can be more readily manipulated by an author. Keeping these factors in mind we will investigate whether repeated patterns or actions associated with groups of names could indicate social biases or perceptions.²¹

To begin, consider the forty-eight characters in Second Maccabees that act in a negative way (i.e. what they do is detrimental to the maintenance of the law or to the success of pious Jews): all but one can be categorised as having a foreign (non-Jewish) name. In addition (and to be fair) there are also two different men called Simon, a name well attested in both Greek and Hebrew.²² However, in both instances our author elects to spell 'Simon' in its acknowledged Greek form [Σίμων] and does not use the Hebrew version 'Simeon' – the Grecised version we would expect to find in the text being: Συμεών or Σιμέων.²³ Therefore, whether or not these men did have Hebrew names, the

²¹ Use the flowchart attached at Appendix Four to assist in following the forthcoming argument.

²² II Macc. III.4, VIII.22. For the numerous references to Simon as a Greek name see Fraser P.M. and Mathews E. [Eds.] *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* Vol. I-III (Oxford, 1987-2000). For early and late Biblical references see entries under 'Simeon' and 'Simon' in Buttrick G.A. [Ed.] *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible* In Four Vols. (Abingdon: Nashville, 1962); or any good Biblical Commentary. Note also Pape W. and Bensler G.E. [Eds.] *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* In Two Vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1959) 1393ff.

²³ See Pape et al. (1959) 1392, 1393ff, 1457. None of these three spellings – Σίμων, Συμεών or Σιμέων – are of course exclusive to one ethnic group, 'Simon' is just predominantly Greek and 'Simeon' predominantly Hebrew – note, for example, Pape et al.'s entry 14 under Σίμων [(1959) 1394]. See also

choice our author made in representing Simon as Greek could be significant, perhaps providing for us an early indicator of who our author believes is responsible for threatening Judaism. One thing we do know is that our author was aware of the subtleties of Greek words and their meanings, to a level that he could have transliterated the Hebrew version of Simeon – but he chose not to. As a result, it seems reasonable to categorise these individuals' names (Simon) as foreign (Greek). This means that there is only one character, Mattathias, who has a Hebrew name and whose role we can possibly classify as 'negative'.²⁴

Now, Mattathias is one of three characters who negotiate a treaty with Judas on behalf of Nicanor [II Macc. XIV.18ff], the other two being Posidonius and Theodotus [II Macc. XIV.19]. Despite the Greek names of his two counterparts these three men were probably Jews as it would make sense for Nicanor to use locals in order to facilitate smoother negotiations.²⁵ The treaty itself is initially successful, although it is soon undermined by Alcimus who has the ear of the king [II Macc. XIV.26ff]. The outcome of the negotiations notwithstanding, the reason for our negative classification of these three actors is that they were demonstrably on the side of Judas' enemies: Nicanor sent them to Judas to undertake discussions.²⁶

With regard to Mattathias himself we can say very little. Either, he was so named in order to inform the reader that these negotiators were Jews – the reason for which we

Feldman (1993) 15, and Cohen [N.G. 'Jewish Names As Cultural Indicators' In *Journal for the Study of Judaism* VII (1976) 97-128 esp. 112-117] who associates the Hebrew name Shime'on to Greek influence.

²⁴ II Macc. XIV.19. Not to be confused with Judas' father, cf. I Macc. II.1.

²⁵ Mattathias clearly was Jewish, and Theodotus (which corresponds to Elnathan/Jonathan) was a name commonly used by Jews; see Goldstein (1983) 489.

²⁶ II Macc. XIV.19: 'So he [Nicanor] sent Posidonius, Theodotus and Mattathias to give and to receive pledges' [διόπερ ἔπεμψεν Ποσιδώνιον καὶ Θεόδοτον καὶ Ματταθίαν, δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν δεξιάς].

could speculate about *ad nauseam* and still be no closer to the truth – or, Mattathias could simply be the historical name of one of Nicanor’s negotiators. In short, apart from demonstrating that our author recognises that Jews can be opposed to ‘traditional Judaism’ (or a particular interpretation of the Torah!)²⁷, it is difficult to reach any conclusion on why this character is the only Jewish named actor in Second Maccabees who acts against Judaism. Mattathias is best viewed as an exception in a study that – as we shall shortly see – clearly indicates some hostility toward foreigners, in particular Greeks.

To this end, let us leave aside this one actor and turn our attention to the remaining forty-seven characters who both do something that is detrimental to the Jewish cause, Judaism and/or Judas’ rebellion and who have a foreign name. Our first observation is that by far the majority of these names are Greek: to be specific up to forty-four of the forty-seven names. As has been our practice previously, we will begin our discussion with the non-Greek names. In short there are two names that are definitely not Greek, Auranus [II Macc. IV.40] and Rhodocus [II Macc. XIII.21]. We also have (at least) one name that is probably Iranian, Hycarnus [II Macc. III.11] and another two names whose origins are questionable. We will discuss each, briefly, in turn. The first, Auranus, is introduced to us as the leader of forces that attack the citizens of Jerusalem on orders from Lysimachus – an action that earns him the description of an old fool. At any rate, he is clearly aligned with the forces our author views as besieging Judaism (i.e. he is demonstrably a ‘negative’ actor). The name itself – Auranus – is a little more difficult to categorise. For a start, it is not listed by Fraser et al. or Pape et al., although it

²⁷ With regard to individual Jews who betray their own people, as we saw earlier, our author clearly recognises that this was occurring. For example, in an authorial assertion early in Chapter Five Jason is described (twice) as ‘a butcher of his fellow citizens’ [II Macc. V.6, 8]; while Nicanor also had Jews in his army [II Macc. XV.2].

does seem likely that it is related to Αὔρανα – a name attested in the Arabian deserts.²⁸ Goldstein does note that this is a name borne in the Hasmonaeon family, recognising that another variant – Auaran – is found in some manuscripts and is recorded by Josephus as the additional name for Eleazar, the brother of Judas.²⁹ None of this is particularly helpful to us. The association of this name with the Hasmonaeon family certainly does not make it Hebrew.³⁰ The best connection seems to the Arab world, and correspondingly we will categorise it as (probably) Arabic.

The second actor for us to consider is Rhodocus, a ‘soldier in the Jewish ranks’ who betrayed Judas’ army by passing secret information to the enemy.³¹ He was, we learn, caught and duly punished for his traitorous actions. Now, the content of the story implies that the soldier was Jewish or at the least ranged with the Jews – he betrays Judas’ army. However, his name is not Hebrew, nor is it Greek or Arabic. The most probable origin seems to be Iranian, a conclusion for which tentative support can be found in the letter of Aristeas where it is made clear that some Jews in this period did have Iranian names. The best we can do, therefore, is classify this name as ‘foreign’ and ‘non-Greek’ (Iranian).³²

²⁸ See Pape et al. Also note comments at Appendix Three. For statistical purposes (and in Appendix Four) the name is categorised as Arabic.

²⁹ Josephus *Antiquities* XII 6.1 (266). See Goldstein (1983) 242. Note also that Goldstein speculates at this point as to this old man being another ‘evil Hasmonaeon counterpart of the martyr Eleazar who is the hero of [II Macc.] VI.18-31’. While not directly relevant to our discussion Goldstein’s suggestion does at least illustrate how name choice and association could be used by our author to imply his attitudes and/or beliefs concerning particular individuals or groups of people.

³⁰ It could, however, be an indicator of political alliances. This possibility demonstrates how the analysis of names can provide insights into the perceived origins and/or associates of actors in a particular text.

³¹ II Macc. XIII.21: προσήγγειλεν δὲ τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς πολεμίοις Ῥόδοκος ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς τάξεως.

³² See *Aristeas* 49-50. For a possible Iranian connection to ‘Rhodocus’ see Goldstein (1983) 266. Neither Fraser et al. or Pape et al. has an entry under this name. We categorise the name as Iranian.

There is another name that could also be Iranian: Hyrcanus [II Macc. III.11], although the assignment (again) is far from certain. The character himself is almost certainly Jewish: our author introduces him as the son of Tobias and, therefore, as a member of a very prominent Jewish family.³³ Given this heritage it is interesting that the character does not have a Hebrew name. This notwithstanding, there is a possibility that the name could be Greek: Fraser et al., for example, lists it as such, and it is attested in an inscription from Attica.³⁴ To some extent this seems reasonable since the Tobiad family was clearly Hellenised and did well under the successor kingdoms (especially the Ptolemies).³⁵ In such a context a Greek name is understandable. Yet we cannot categorically label Hyrcanus as Greek since other options do exist – as we indicated earlier, Iranian is another possibility.³⁶ To this end and to try to avoid arbitrary, speculative classifications, we will categorise this name in terms of what we do know: that it is foreign (i.e. not Hebrew), but we will not list it as Greek.

The remaining two names are the references to Simon that we discussed earlier. In both instances the Hellenic spelling is used by our author and as a result we have categorised these names as Greek.³⁷ This means that, of the forty-eight hostile or negative actors in Second Maccabees there is only one that has a Hebrew name (Mattathias). This left forty-seven actors with foreign names, three of which are not Greek (Auranus,

³³ Or son of Joseph son of Tobias; see Josephus *Antiquities* XII 4.6-11.186-236.

³⁴ SEG 799. Fraser et al. s.v. See also comments by Ilan T 'The Greek Names of the Hasmoneans' In *Jewish Quarterly Review* 78 (1987)1-20, esp. 1-2; and Schürer (1973) I.201-2.

³⁵ See Goldstein (1983) 207ff and his article 'The Tales of The Tobiads' (1975) 85-123.

³⁶ Emphasised, especially, by Erich Gruen when he kindly commented on an earlier draft of this Chapter. For statistical purposes (and in Appendix Four) the name is categorised as Iranian.

³⁷ See discussion above from n. 22 and text, this Chapter.

Rhodocus, and Hycarnus). This means, however, that forty-four of these characters do have Hellenic names; or to convert this to a percentage, ninety-two percent of all the named actors in Second Maccabees that act in a negative way have or receive a Greek name from our author. Certainly, in most cases these forty-four characters are simply the various generals, district governors or king's friends whom Judas opposes in the course of his campaigns.³⁸ There is nothing surprising or unusual in this: as senior officials in the Seleucid empire their role would both classify them as negative actors, and provide a signal or expectation of some form of Hellenic influence – evidenced by their Greek names. Be that as it may, and even when we take into account the time period and acknowledge that Greek names would have been increasing in frequency and acceptance, this remains a very high figure. Moreover, this is only part of the story for when we cross-reference the Greek names with the ethnicity of the individuals involved, some interesting observations become apparent.

First, and again as we would expect, thirty-three of the forty-four are either Greeks or Hellenised non-Jews. It is the remaining eleven individuals that are the most interesting, they are all Jews with Greek names.³⁹ Furthermore, a quick look at the statistics presented indicate that these individuals represent the majority of Jews who act in a negative way. If we may reiterate briefly, we have identified fifteen Jews whose actions we have categorised as negative. Only one has a Hebrew name, Mattathias

³⁸ Examples include Appollonius – the Governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia [III.5]; Heliodorus – Chief Minister of the king [III.7]; Nicanor – king's friend [VIII.9].

³⁹ Simon [III.4]; Jason [IV.7]; Menelaus [IV.23]; Lysimachus [IV.29]; Simon [VII.22]; Dositheus [XII.19]; Sosipater [XII.19]; Dositheus [XII.35]; Alcimus [XIV.3]; and Posidonius and Theodotus [XIV.19] who are probably Jewish – they, along with Mattathias, help negotiate (on behalf of the Seleucids) the treaty between Nicanor/Demetrius and Judas. We assessed Hyrcanus as foreign but non-Greek (probably Iranian), although we noted at the same time that the name could be (and has been accepted by some – cf. Fraser et al.) as Greek. If this were the case it would further increase the apparent association between Greek names and negative actions.

[XIV.19]. Another three have foreign non-Greek names, Auranus [IV.40], Rhodocus [XIII.21] and Hyrcanus [III.11]. We are left with eleven Jews all of whom have Greek names. In other words, if a Jew does something that is detrimental to Judaism, he is most likely (specifically 74% of the time) to have a Greek name and very unlikely (only seven percent of the time) to have a Hebrew name.⁴⁰ This, at least, is the world that our author saw and recorded.

Simon, Dositheus and Sosipater

These figures make it clear that there seems to be a strong correlation between negative actions and Greek names (or more broadly Hellenism/Hellenic associations). Statistics though are not in themselves always (if ever!) the conveyer of the full picture. To that end, let us look a little closer at some of these eleven cases we have highlighted and consider, for example, Judas' commanders. To be specific, there are two occasions in Second Maccabees when Judas' commanders fail him and Judaism. The first is the account of how Simon's men accepted bribes and let some of the Idumaeans they were besieging slip through their lines. Consider the relevant passage in full:

... Συμφυγόντων δὲ οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν ἐνακισχιλίων εἰς δύο πύργους ὄχυροὺς εὖ μάλα, καὶ πάντα τὰ πρὸς πολιορκίαν ἔχοντας, ὁ Μακκαβαῖος εἰς ἐπείγοντας τόπους ἀπολείπων Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰώσηπον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ζακχαῖον καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ ἱκανοὺς πρὸς τὴν τούτων πολιορκίαν, αὐτὸς ἐχωρίσθη. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σίμωνα φιλαργυρήσαντες ὑπὸ τινων τῶν ἐν τοῖς πύργοις ἐπείσθησαν ἀργυρίῳ· ἐπτάκις δὲ μυρίας δραχμὰς λαβόντες, εἵασάν τινας διαρρυῆναι. Προσαγγελλέντες δὲ τῷ Μακκαβαίῳ περὶ τοῦ γεγονότος, συναγαγὼν τοὺς ἡγουμένους τοῦ λαοῦ, κατηγόρησεν ὡς ἀργυρίου πέπρακαν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, τοὺς πολεμίους κατ' αὐτῶν ἀπολύσαντες. τούτους μὲν οὖν προδότας γενομένους ἀπέκτεινεν, καὶ παραχρῆμα τοὺς δύο πύργους κατελάβετο. τοῖς δὲ ὅπλοις τὰ πάντα ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν εὐδούμενος, ἀπώλεσεν ἐν τοῖς δυσὶν ὄχυρώμασιν πλείους τῶν δισμυρίων.

⁴⁰ Or, a Jew that 'acts' against Judaism has a foreign name 93% of the time.

‘But no fewer than nine thousand of them [i.e. the Idumaeans Judas was attacking; cf. II Macc. X.14-17] took refuge in two very well fortified towers with everything ready for [withstanding] a siege. Maccabaeus himself departed for places where he was urgently needed and left behind Simon and Josephus, with Zacchaeus and his men in sufficient strength to besiege them. But Simon’s men were lovers of money, and were persuaded by some in the towers with money. Once they had accepted 70 000 drachmas, they let some people slip through their lines. These matters were brought to the attention of Maccabaeus. Assembling the leaders of the people [army] he denounced those who had sold out their brothers for money by letting their enemies escape to fight again. He then had these men executed as traitors and straightaway he captured the two towers. In his military operations he had total success with what he took in hand; he killed more than twenty thousand in the two strongholds.’ [II Macc. X.18-23]

There are several points of interest raised by this passage. First, there seems little doubt that this story is included to promote the capabilities of Judas. Upon hearing of what had happened it is Judas who takes the decisive action, promptly returning, executing the traitors and reducing the strongholds. Second, in the process of describing these events our author also discredits Judas’ brother, Simon. It is events such as this that have provided material for at least one modern scholar to develop an hypothesis that our author is writing anti-Hasmonaeen propaganda. While this theory remains unproved, there can be little doubt that there is a political purpose to this story that goes beyond the actual historical event.⁴¹ In turn this means that the account would have undergone extensive reworking by our author thereby providing the opportunity for personal and/or societal prejudices and perceptions to be included. With this in mind, it is interesting to

⁴¹ See, e.g. Goldstein, who is adamant that there is an anti-Hasmonaeen bias in Second Maccabees; a theory developed in both his *Maccabaeen Commentaries* [See (1976) 4-8, 62-89; (1983) e.g. Pp. 4: where he labels the author of First Maccabees the Hasmonaeen propagandist and emphasises how he believes the authors were bitter opponents]. See also Schürer (1986) III. 532-3. For some political associations and the context of the passage, including how Simon is identified as Judas’ brother and is deliberately discredited – see Goldstein (1983) 390.

observe that: First, the brother discredited is the one whose name could be Greek; and second, that this story varies from a version present in Josephus and First Maccabees.

This later point we will return to shortly, for now let us expand a little more on our first observation. In this account our author makes mention of two other commanders, specifically Josephus and Zacchaeus. It has been assumed by some that these men were involved in the treachery or, in more neutral terms the military failure, but our author does not actually suggest this.⁴² To the contrary, we are specifically told that it was Simon's men (not anybody else's) who failed:

οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Σίμωνα φιλαργυρήσαντες ὑπὸ τινων τῶν ἐν τοῖς πύργοις ἐπείσθησαν ἀργυρίῳ· ἐπτάκις δὲ μυρίας δραχμὰς λαβόντες, εἵασάν τινας διαρρυῆναι.

'But *Simon's men* were lovers of money, and were persuaded by some in the towers with money. Once they had accepted 70 000 drachmas, they let some people slip through their lines'.⁴³

The emphasis here is clear: it was Simon's men that allowed some of those besieged in the fortresses to escape. No other commander is mentioned or even indirectly referred to as being responsible for the debacle.⁴⁴ This leaves us with an interesting

⁴² See, for example, Goldstein (1983) 390.

⁴³ II Macc. X.20, emphasis added.

⁴⁴ The principal concern here is to demonstrate that Josephus and Zacchaeus cannot be held responsible. As we have shown, Simon's men are directly blamed for the event, which in itself indicates who is responsible. Further support can be derived from the following lines where it is reinforced that it was some of the soldiers, not specifically the commanders, that were guilty of treason: Judas assembles the 'leaders of the people' (whoever they actually were: cf. Goldstein (1983) 391, and our discussion on this passage in Chapter Three, above) to sit in judgement over 'those who had sold their brothers for money by letting the enemy escape' [II Macc. X.21]. The passage draws a distinction between the accused and their judges based on rank. The accused, therefore, are not ranking commanders. In fact the only commander that is in some way associated with the treason is Simon (the guilty were 'Simon's men'). This observation and the fact that there is no mention of Josephus or Zacchaeus in a negative capacity militates against any assumption that they were guilty of treason.

observation when we compare the commanders' respective names. As we indicated, three commanders are mentioned in this passage. Two have Hebrew names (Josephus and Zacchaeus) and are not blamed for the military failure. The one commander who is held to account happens to have a name that could be Greek, or at the very least is given to us in its Greek form!

Furthermore, this is not the last time that we meet Simon. In Chapter Fourteen Nicanor advances against Judaea. Before Judas arrives, Simon engages the Seleucid forces in battle:

Σίμων δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ἰούδου συμβεβληκὸς ἦν τῷ Νικάνορι, βραδέως δέ, διὰ τὴν αἰφνίδιον τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἀφασίαν ἐπταικῶς.

Simon, Judas' brother, had already joined battle with Nicanor and suffered a slight setback because the enemy arrived suddenly.⁴⁵

In this description of events Simon's ability as a commander is again found wanting. Certainly, the passage does present us with some mitigating factors in terms of the 'degree of loss' and the (weak) explanatory comment that our author provides. This, however, does not diminish the underlying fact that Simon fails. Once more it is the Greek-named Jewish commander whose actions and abilities are undermined. Of course we are not advocating that it is because he has a Greek name that Simon is a failure. Rather it is this course of events in conjunction with a Greek name that adds to the development of a 'negative' image.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ II Macc. XIV.17. Whether or not the verb συμβάλλειν is understood in terms of 'to have conversations with'; i.e. diplomacy (cf. Acts IV.15); or 'to join battle with' (cf. II Macc. VIII.23) there is clearly a failing (regardless of degree) on the part of Simon. It is this failure with which we are concerned. For more discussion on translating this passage see Goldstein (1983) 487, 489.

⁴⁶ The describing of Simon as Judas' brother also strongly indicates that there is a political purpose to this passage. As we have mentioned previously Goldstein asserts that our author wrote (in part) to balance (correct) the pro-Hasmonaean bias evident in First Maccabees [Goldstein (1983) 4]. Regardless, our

The second failure to consider occurs under Dositheus and Sosipater [II Macc. XII.19]. When we first meet these commanders all seems well; they lead their troops to victory and destroy a stronghold at Charax which was garrisoned by over ten thousand of Timotheus' soldiers [II Macc. XII.17-19]. Shortly afterwards these same soldiers actually capture Timotheus, however they fail to hold him. Through a simple deception Timotheus convinces Dositheus and Sosipater to let him go, which they do:

αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐμπεσὼν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Δοσίθεον καὶ Σωσίπατρον ἡξίου μετὰ πολλῆς γοητίας ἐξαφεῖναι ὡς σῶον αὐτόν, διὰ τὸ πλειόνων μὲν γονεῖς, ὧν δὲ ἀδελφοὺς ἔχειν, καὶ τούτους ἀλογηθῆναι συμβήσεται· πιστώσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ διὰ πλειόνων τὸν ὅρισμόν ἀποκαταστήσαι τούτους ἀπημάντους, ἀπέλυσαν αὐτὸν ἔνεκα τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν σωτηρίας.

Timotheus himself was taken prisoner by Dositheus and Sosipater, but begged with much guile, that they release him unharmed, because he held many of their ancestors and some of their brothers and unreasonable things could happen to them. Having put faith in his many promises to restore the prisoners unharmed, they released him in order to save their brothers.

[II Macc. XII.24-25]

The passage makes it clear who is responsible for Timotheus' escape: Dositheus and Sosipater. Certainly it is true that our author appears to make this observation without any malice or, at least, direct (objective) hostility. To reiterate, however, it is the repeated underlying (subjective) patterning that interests us. To that end, the point that is most interesting is that the commanders that demonstratively fail are those with Greek names. Moreover, in addition to Judas' brother Simon, these are the only commanders in Judas' army – that our author decides to mention – who have Greek names. Not only that, but if we include the failure of Dositheus to capture Gorgias (discussed below [II Macc. XII.35]) these are all the military failures that occur (from the perspective of the Jews)

hypothesis is not undermined: Greek names were utilised by our author to help construct a negative perception.

after Judas begins his campaign in defence of Judaism.⁴⁷ In short, we appear to have the introduction of some prejudice by our author against his Greek-named Jewish commanders, who, while not necessarily inept all of the time, do inevitably endure humiliating military reversals.

Of course these descriptions of events and even the naming of the commanders may not be the result of deliberate patterning by our author. The presence of Greek names in both these accounts could be coincidental or an accurate reflection of an historical reality. There is, however, a further observation we can make, concerning both the examples we have discussed, which militates against an arbitrary dismissal of the possibility that our author was manipulating his representation of events. Consider once more the account of Timotheus' escape that we have just introduced. At the parallel point in both Josephus' *Antiquities* and First Maccabees there is no mention of this story.⁴⁸ However there is an account of a military failure. Instead of Dositheus and Sosipater we learn of two Jewish commanders who act contrary to Judas' instructions and are decisively beaten. The important difference is that these commanders have Hebrew names – Josephus and Azarias. In other words, our author appears either to have replaced an account of two Hebrew-named commanders disobeying orders and failing militarily,

⁴⁷ Judas begins his campaigning from Chapter Eight (before this point in the text there are military setbacks for the Jews, e.g. II Macc. V.11, 25; albeit administered by Greek named Seleucid commanders!). From the start of Chapter Eight until the end of the text there are a total of nine campaigns described (although some are connected, i.e. Nicanor's advance [II Macc. VIII.12ff] is a result of Judas' military actions [II Macc. VIII.5ff]). The campaigns can be found at II Macc. VIII.5ff, 12ff, 30; X.14, 24; XI.1ff; XII.1ff; XIII.1ff; XIV.12ff (the battles described from XV.1ff are considered to be part of Nicanor's campaign that begins at XIV.12). Each campaign may include several military actions: e.g. Antiochus Eupator and Lysias advance against Judaea [II Macc. XIII.1ff]. This advance or campaign incorporates three military actions or battles – II Macc. XIII.14ff: Judas' attack near Modin, XIII.19ff: the king's advance on Bethsur; XIII.22ff: the king's attack on Judas. In all these battles the only events that resemble a failure for the Jewish cause are those associated with Greek-named Jews.

⁴⁸ See Josephus *Antiquities* XII.350-2 and I Macc. V.56-65.

with another that has two Greek-named Jews failing; or to have selected a particular event from various possible episodes. With both possibilities this could have been a deliberate manipulation to discredit 'Hellenisers' or, if it was the latter, a demonstration of the subconscious bias which we are arguing is evident in the text.

This observation notwithstanding there is one further complicating factor. In First Maccabees Josephus is introduced to us as the son of Zechariah [I Macc. V.18-19, 56]. Goldstein argues that Zacchaeus is a nickname for Zechariah, which would suggest that our author has further muddled or adjusted the account confusing Josephus' father as a fellow commander.⁴⁹ If this were the case, then it must follow that the account in Second Maccabees of Simon's failure would be a reworked version of the story of Josephus and Azarias that we find in the *Antiquities* and First Maccabees [I Macc. V.56-65]. What is interesting is that if we accept this scenario, then once again the primary difference between the accounts is that our author, while noting the presence of two Hebrew-named commanders (whom he calls Josephus and Zacchaeus), seems to take particular care to minimise their association with any military failure.⁵⁰ In Second Maccabees the military setback is clearly the responsibility of Simon. Therefore, regardless of which story in Second Maccabees we attribute as the representation of the version of events recounted by both Josephus and the author of First Maccabees, our author has clearly reworked the material. In doing so he either deliberately or, as seems more likely, subconsciously, shifted the blame for the military failures onto the Greek named individuals.

⁴⁹ Goldstein (1973) 79-80, (1983) 390.

⁵⁰ In Josephus and First Maccabees Josephus son of Zechariah was an incompetent commander and if (as Goldstein also suggests) he was a half-brother to Simon, why would our author not take more advantage of the story to discredit the Hasmonaeans [Goldstein (1983) 390] – especially if we assume Goldstein is right with regard to the anti-Hasmonaeon bias of our author? It is clear that the arguments Goldstein bases his hypothesis on are, in this circumstance, rather speculative. Based on the information we find in the text of Second Maccabees all we can really conclude is that Joseph and Zacchaeus are loyal commanders, and it is Simon who is discredited.

*

*

*

The remaining references to Greek named individuals further confirm the pattern that we have been discussing. Repeatedly, for instance the Jews that fail Judaism will have a Greek name. We learn, for example, of another Dositheus who is specifically described as a Jew [II Macc. XII.35]. In a battle against Gorgias and his men this Dositheus manages to grasp Gorgias' cloak, but (regardless of the reason) he failed in his endeavours to hold him. Perhaps his devotion to Judaism was not great enough, a point reflected in the origins of his name. At any rate, in the context of the patterning we have identified would we really expect a Greek-named Jew to be presented as a hero, who succeeded in bringing down a Seleucid commander?

In some instances we can demonstrate that the representation of names and events was manipulated by our author. We have, for example, the extensive discussion above. Consider also the account given of the activities of the High Priest Jason.⁵¹ He also was known by his Hebrew name – Jesus – yet it is interesting that our author chooses never to use it.⁵² Of course we cannot show that our author reworked all the characters in this way. We have done enough, however, to raise the possibility of either an intentional or subconscious manipulation of events. Furthermore, regardless of the explanation we attempt to impose, we have made it clear that our author associates negative actions with Greek-named characters.

This conclusion in itself suggests a degree of hostility and a bias against the Greeks on the part of our author. Yet the Greeks only comprise some of the characters in Second Maccabees and are only a part of the story. When we apply this same

⁵¹ Introduced at II Macc. IV.7.

⁵² Josephus gives us his name, see *Antiquities* XII.V.1 (237-38).

methodology to other characters, in particular Hebrew-named individuals, we can uncover some equally interesting insights. If I may foreshadow our upcoming discussion, it appears that our author provides an equally definitive, positive account of Hebrew-named characters and their actions.

Jewish Actors And Hebrew Names

To demonstrate this consider those named individuals who support Judas and Judaism. There are eighteen such characters in Second Maccabees.⁵³ Now, not all of these actors are Jews. There is one Greek, Ptolemaeus Macron [II Macc. X.11], whom we discussed in some detail above. Aretas [II Macc. V.8], the king of the Arabs, recognises the inappropriateness of the actions of Jason [II Macc. IV.7]. However, the Arabs are not always supportive: we also receive an account (albeit with no mention of Aretas) of the Arabs attacking the Jews [cf. II Macc. XII.10]. Finally there are two named Romans [II Macc. XI.34], who are envoys of the Roman people and who support the concessions granted to the Jews by Lysias and Antiochus [II Macc. XI.16-33]. We can say little about these ambassadors except that in many respects their role is supplementary and little would be lost if they and their letter were omitted from the text.⁵⁴

As a group these four characters play a relatively minor role in the text, Ptolemaeus Macron excepted (as demonstrated the dramatic failure of his support for the Jews magnifies the negative perception of the Greeks). At the most the roles ascribed to Aretas and the Roman ambassadors could suggest that our author was not completely ethnocentric. However, I suspect that their inclusion in the text has more to do with

⁵³ See Appendix Three.

⁵⁴ The letter is probably genuine see Goldstein (1983) 422ff; Habicht (1976) 1-18; Grabbe (1992) 259-263; Momigliano (1975a) 81-88. We should also note that there are difficulties with the second Roman ambassador's name: see Goldstein (1983) 423-5; Momigliano (1975a) 85.

historical reality and the recognition by our author of shifting political landscapes and/or power balances. At any rate, the minor roles of these characters and the fact that two appear in the same passage means that they are not a significant grouping of actors.

Therefore, setting aside these examples we are left with fourteen named supporters of Judas, all of whom are Jewish.⁵⁵ The most obvious comment that is generated by this figure is that it represents a high proportion of the positive characters, to be specific just under 78%. To some extent this is a result that is not completely unexpected. We must remember that Second Maccabees is a text introduced as an account of how Judas defended Judaism, so we would expect Jews to be supportive. Be that as it may, we can gain further insights by analysing these fourteen characters in the same way that we did with the previous Greek named individuals. Let us be specific, of these fourteen Jews thirteen have Hebrew names. With the exception of Biblical/Historical references and the treaty negotiator Mattathias (that we discussed earlier), these thirteen individuals represent the remaining characters in Second Maccabees that have a Hebrew name.⁵⁶ In other words, our author nearly always (nearly 93% of the time) presents a Hebrew-named character in a positive way.⁵⁷

In addition there is one Jew who acts in a positive way but does not have a Hebrew name: Eupolemus [II Macc. IV.11], a Jew with a Greek name. Our author informs us that Eupolemus was the Jewish representative who later negotiated a treaty

⁵⁵ The fourteen named characters that can be classified as positive are: Judas [II.19]; Onias [III.1]; John [IV.11]; Eupolemus [IV.11]; Eleazar [VI.18]; Josephus [VIII.22]; Jonathan [VIII.22]; Eleazar [VIII.22]; Josephus [X.19]; Zacchaeus [X.19]; John [XI.17]; Absalom [XI.17]; Esdras [XII.36]; and Razis [XIV.37]. See also Appendix Three and Appendix Four.

⁵⁶ There are three Biblical/Historical references: Moses, II Macc. VII.6; Jeremiah II Macc. XV.14; Hezekiah II Macc. XV.22. Mattathias [II Macc. XIV.19] is discussed above.

⁵⁷ The statistic is calculated by recognising that there are only fourteen named Hebrew characters who 'act'; thirteen are positive, one is negative (there are three additional Biblical/Historical references that are omitted as Descriptive).

with the Romans.⁵⁸ As the Romans are considered friends of the Jews by both the actors in Second Maccabees and by our author Eupolemus' actions are classified as being positive.⁵⁹ It is interesting to note several points, however, which perhaps go some way towards explaining why this character is not subject to the patterning we have identified. First, we have a description of a person who acts outside of the time period with which our author is concerned, and a period where Greek names would have been even more prominent amongst most peoples in the region. Second, having a Greek name when engaged in diplomatic relations with the Romans would probably be beneficial.⁶⁰ This could also suggest that the adoption and use of Hellenic names, institutions and customs when done so by Jews for their own purposes could well be perfectly acceptable (another variation of the 'tension' we identified towards the end of the previous chapter). Third, the negotiating of a treaty with the Romans would have been a prominent event in recent history and everyone would have known who the Jewish representatives were, so our author just reported what was common knowledge.⁶¹ This seems to be the most likely scenario, although it is still interesting our author makes it clear that Eupolemus (regardless of his name's origins), is from a strong Jewish heritage. His father – John – has a good Hebrew name and is presented as a loyal Jew: this is the John that negotiated royal privileges for the Jews from Antiochus III. At any rate, when we consider the overall context of the patterning we have identified this one anomaly does not discredit

⁵⁸ See Goldstein (1976) 359; (1983) 228-229 and I Macc. VIII.17ff.

⁵⁹ Cf. II Macc. IV.11; XI.34ff; note also I Macc. VIII.1ff, esp. 17ff; XII. 1ff; XIV.16ff; XIV.40; XV.15-24.

⁶⁰ This observation does not mean that Hebrew named individuals could not be ambassadors for the Jewish people, cf. II Macc. IV.11; XI.17.

⁶¹ That everyone knew that Eupolemus negotiated the treaty with the Romans is implied in the language that our author uses at this point: '*that* Eupolemus who at a later date negotiated a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Romans' (emphasis added) [II Macc. IV.11].

the entire argument: societal perceptions, biases and beliefs do not fall into tidy boxes. There will always be complicating grey issues and areas: what is important are the general trends.

Let us return, therefore, to the thirteen Hebrew-named Jews who are represented in a positive way. It will not benefit us greatly to go through each character and scenario in turn. Rather it is sufficient to observe that not only are these characters' actions seen as positive, they are also presented as stout defenders of Judaism. Our author spends a lot of space emphasising the positive aspects of these characters: consider how, for example, Onias III is described as 'pious' [εὐσέβεια] and as having 'a hatred of wickedness' [μισοπονηρία]; while Eleazar is a 'leading teacher of the law, a man of great age and distinguished bearing' [Ἐλεάζαρος τις τῶν πρωτευόντων γραμματέων, ἀνὴρ ἥδη προβεβηκὸς τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ τὴν πρόσοψιν τοῦ προσώπου κάλλιστος ...]; etc.⁶² The positive attributes of these individuals are emphasised through their connection with traditional values.⁶³ There seems little doubt that part of this image or character development is the ethnicity of their names. It would not seem 'right' for a defender of traditional Jewish values to have anything but a Hebrew name.⁶⁴

There is one further observation we can make with regard to these Hebrew-named characters. On several occasions they are set up against an opponent. In each case that opponent is either Greek or has a Greek name. Consider the contrast between the 'pious'

⁶² See II Macc. III.1 (Onias) and VI.18 (Eleazar).

⁶³ This also demonstrates a boundary: identification as to who is or is not a Jew is clearly linked (for our author at least) to one's heritage.

⁶⁴ This helps explain why it is, e.g., (another) Eleazar (or perhaps Ezra, see Goldstein (1983) 334-5) that reads from the holy book [II Macc. VIII.23]; it is a John who provides credibility to Eupolemus' traditional heritage [II Macc. IV.11: see also discussion above]; and a pious Razis who defies Nicanor's men by committing suicide [II Macc. XIV. 37-46]. It seems clear that the ethnicity of the name helps establish or emphasise a character's role.

Onias III and the 'godless' Simon [II Macc. III.4]; while Eleazer's torture occurs at a time when an *Athenian* pollutes the Temple and compels Jews to reject ancient customs and the law [II Macc. VI.1ff]. Or it is Razis' piousness (not to mention his devotion to the law and resultant standing amongst the Jews) that provokes the wrath of Nicanor [II Macc. XIV.37ff]. The repetition of such underlying hostility and conflict cannot be ignored or, in light of our analysis, underestimated. The names of the actors involved can be understood, in part at least, to symbolise the pitting of Seleucid power and policy against Jewish traditions and religion. This in turn suggests that our author may well have perceived Greeks and Jews as opposing forces, even if the nature of that opposition was symbolic of other issues or concepts: Greekness was a visual, easily identifiable part of the changing world that was undermining traditional Jewish values (which, in terms of our earlier discussions, could be seen as equating to Jewish identity). In this context the Greeks and Hellenism are the enemy.

* * *

We have spent considerable time presenting and discussing a lot of statistics in this chapter. While the attached Table and Flowchart help unravel these numbers to some extent⁶⁵, it is also worthwhile to summarise our argument and conclusions briefly before moving on. Let us begin, therefore, with the characters categorised as Greek. Except for Ptolemaus Macron, who can hardly be described as a champion of the Jewish cause, every Greek character in Second Maccabees is presented as being hostile towards Judaism. There seems to be no room for Greek sympathisers in our author's world view.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ See Appendix Three and Four respectively.

⁶⁶ A point reinforced by the fate of Ptolemy Macron; cf. II Macc. X.11.

This apparent bias against Greeks is reinforced when we cross-reference all the characters in Second Maccabees who act negatively toward Judaism with the ethnicity of their names. Forty-seven of the forty-eight characters in this category have non-Hebrew names and forty-four (92%) of them have Greek names. Furthermore, of the fifteen cases in which named Jews betray Judaism, fourteen have foreign names and eleven of them have Greek names. This last statistic is particularly interesting as it not only reinforces our author's perception of things Greek, but also recognises that Jewish society was split. Those Jews presented as against the traditional values of their people tended to be connected to the Greeks through, among other things, their names.

We would, of course, expect some polarisation towards or against different groups given the nature of the events being described. However, the positive and negative associations that our author develops towards different ethnic groups and the markers of those ethnic groups (i.e. the ethnic origin of names) is striking. So much so that even if we allow for a difference in categorisation of some actors by another reader the underlying trend is, and would remain, well established. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that we have managed to identify an underlying belief of our author, which could represent a societal construct from his time.

Now, I am not trying to suggest that our author sat down and deliberately constructed his work so that Greek names were associated with negative actions/events and Hebrew names to good ones. Such an argument could be (and should be) easily discredited and discarded.⁶⁷ Furthermore, in recounting his version of Jason's History we must accept that to some extent our author would have been governed by literary

⁶⁷ The argument that our author deliberately penned this work as anti-Greek propaganda, deliberately vilifying all the Greek characters may be able to be made, but from the analysis we have conducted such a conclusion seems far to speculative. In short, the reality is always more complex with extensive 'grey' areas and seldom has neat, all inclusive categories. To that end, the existence of our exceptions (as a start) indicate that our theory is much more than a premeditated vilification of Greeks.

constructs and the historical events themselves. These general principles notwithstanding, our theory asserts that societal beliefs and attitudes of the time would mould or provide the framework for the final literary product. Therefore we can interpret the attitudes evident in Second Maccabees both as a 'product of' and 'reinforcement of' societal perceptions. Whether it was our author's intention or not, the roles assigned to names illustrate, even if it is from a subconscious level, his prejudices, which are probably representative of large portions of his society. In other words, the Greeks were being blamed on some level by Jewish society for changes to the traditional Jewish way of life – even if those changes were voluntarily adopted. Of course, this conclusion in itself opens up a range of tensions and contradictions that require examination, something that we will address in the following chapter. Let us end our discussion here with a final comment: our observations – in short, the subjective elements of the text – strongly suggest that we should not be so fast in dismissing the age old dichotomy of Jew versus Greek, Hellenism versus Judaism.

Chapter Eight

Recognising Reality: The Existence of Hellenistic Judaism

‘From the middle of the third century B.C. all Judaism must really be designated “Hellenistic Judaism” in the strict sense’.¹

This is not the first time we have introduced Hengel’s assessment as to the state of Judaism in the Third (and subsequent) Centuries B.C.E. Our original purpose was to summarise the modern interpretations of Second Maccabees and to present the current widely accepted view of Jewish society in the Second Century B.C.E., in particular how the peoples of Judaea were Hellenised (as emphasised by Hengel’s statement). Of course not all scholars agree with Hengel’s assessment, but even the dissenting voices are (in general) more concerned with the extent of Hellenisation rather than a complete rejection of his view. Recognising that Judaism was Hellenised in any way does not appear to sit easily with our discussion. To date we have focussed on areas of divergence; or (to use some of the terminology that we have adopted) the boundary between Greek and Jew has seemingly been marked through the dismissal of Hellenic concepts. Of course, some mitigation is available in that our categorisations are largely artificial, developed in order

¹ Hengel (1974) 104. The point has been made several times throughout this paper, although not discussed in its own right until now. See also Applebaum (1979/80) 158-77; Bickerman (1937/1976) *passim*, Bickerman E.J. *From Ezra To The Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism* (Schocken Books: New York; 1962) *passim*, (1976) in several of his papers therein, (1988) *passim*; Collins J.J. ‘Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Environment’. In *BASOR* 220 (1975) 27-36, (1983) *passim*; Grabbe (1995) 53-83; Hengel (1980) *passim*, (1989) 167-228; Levine (1998) *passim* esp. 3-15; Lieberman S. *Greek In Jewish Palestine* (New York, 1942) *passim*, *Hellenism In Jewish Palestine* Second Ed. (New York, 1962) *passim*; Rajak (1990) 261-80; Smith (1956) 67-81; Tcherikover (1957) I 1-112, (1959) *passim*.

As we have noted, debate that questions, if not the existence then at least the extent of Hellenic influence, is also extensive. See, especially: Feldman (1993) *passim* esp. 3-83; Levine L.I. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Hendrickson: Seattle and London; 1998) 14-15 (with extensive references); Millar (1978) 1-21, (1987) 110-133.

to emphasise the various points we have discussed. The reality is very different, the boundary between Jewishness and Hellenism is not clearly defined.

To some extent this is an issue that we have already raised. Our analysis of the subjective elements in the text has introduced inherent contradictions that we have labelled as 'tensions'. To reiterate briefly, we have demonstrated that the Greeks were perceived as responsible for the changes that were occurring in Jewish society. Yet not everything Greek was anathema to the Jews who did adopt several Hellenic concepts. The most obvious example of this is that our author – a Jew – wrote Second Maccabees – a text that is undoubtedly fundamentally Jewish in character – in Greek.² While we could speculate *ad nauseam* as to the reason(s) behind our author's choice, any conclusion would not change the underlying fact that he is demonstrating how the use of the Greek language for Jewish literature was, if not acceptable, then necessary in order to reach the widest possible audience. To reinforce this point we can also note that in the third and subsequent centuries B.C.E. numerous religious and historical texts were, either written or translated into Greek by the Jews. The most prominent example that supports this assertion is, of course, the Septuagint itself.³

² A conclusion reached primarily because of the subject matter, linguistic style and the language (word choice) our author employs. See our discussion in the Introduction and note Goldstein (1983) 19ff, esp. n. 54; Momigliano (1975a) 83.

³ For more on the writing of the Septuagint see as an introduction: Anderson (1970) 146; Jellicoe (1968) *passim*; Jellicoe S. [Ed.] *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, Interpretations* (New York, 1974); Schürer (1986) III.474ff; *Letter of Aristeas* – A Translation and Introduction can be found in Shutt (1985) 7-34; objections to the date and authorship proposed by the *Letter of Aristeas* can be found in Hadas M. *Aristeas To Philocrates* (New York, London; 1951). See also Aristobulus Fr. I.16 [Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* VII.32.16-18], Fr. III.2 [Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* XIII.12.1ff]; note that Aristobulus' work in itself is an example of a Jew writing in Greek and an attempt to relate Jewish tradition with Hellenic culture: see Collins A.Y. 'Aristobulus (Second Century B.C.) A New Translation and Introduction'. In J.H. Charlesworth [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol. Two (Doubleday: New York, 1985) 831-842; Collins (1983) 175-8; Fraser P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria* In Three Vols. (Oxford,) I.695-696, II.963-970; Hengel (1974) I.163ff, II.105-110. Consider also the concluding comments made by Gruen in his book *Heritage and Hellenism*: 'Jews thoroughly imbued with Greek culture but committed to the authority of the

These suggestions are in no way meant to discredit or diminish the importance of the Hebrew (or even Aramaic) language to Jewish identity, something our author is acutely aware of and utilises in his text.⁴ Rather, what our discussion demonstrates is the inherent acceptability of Greek in the wider Jewish community. This is further shown by how our author could, for want of a better descriptive term, ‘almost think’ in Greek. He was very familiar with Greek concepts (as well as linguistic expressions and style) and used them very easily in a Jewish context, so Hellenism (and Judaism) are extensions of the Greek idea of Medism or ‘to medise’. The term Barbarian is used in the same way for the Greeks, albeit from a Jewish perspective. To be fair it is also clear that our author, at times, did struggle with the language, or at least the Greek manuscripts we have can be very difficult to translate – of course this may be a result of the transmission of the text rather than the original writing itself. Our author also, albeit again only occasionally, reverted to what can only be described as a more Jewish interpretation of events. We have noted, for example, how he may have become confused with concepts and labels on occasion, especially the use of ἔθνος in relation to ‘*am* and *goy*’.

These observations notwithstanding, the ability and readiness of the author to present his work in Greek cannot be ignored. In fact it is difficult not to conclude that our author was not just choosing to write this text in Greek, but rather Greek was his day-to-day (literary) language of choice. He is too familiar with some of the idiosyncrasies of the

Book felt full confidence in reproducing its material in forms familiar to their Hellenised compatriots’ [(1998) 294]. At this point Gruen also gives examples of authors placing Biblical stories into Greek moulds, q.v.

⁴ See our discussion below, which – if I may foreshadow my argument to reinforce my comments here – observes how the martyred mother and her seven sons converse in their ancestors’ language [τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ], i.e. probably Hebrew, although considering the time period Aramaic might be meant. Regardless, the point is that it is not Greek, and it is a language which has a meaning (ancestral) to them as a people. Consider also the scarcity of Greek texts found at Qumran: see Vermes G *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (Penguin, 1998) *passim*, esp. 440ff. The importance of Hebrew is also emphasised in other Apocryphal texts, see e.g. *Ecclesiasticus* ‘Preface’.

Greek language to be an infrequent user.⁵ Therefore, our author who as we have demonstrated seems to be biased against Hellenic influences upon Jewish society, is not only fluent in Greek but, as the language is integral to the culture, is probably immersed in the Greek way of thinking (perhaps even lifestyle, although this could be inferring too much considering the actual details that we do have). At the very least it appears that the ability to communicate in Greek was not something that our author deemed was intrusive to Jewish society or that he, as a Jew, had to protect Judaism from.⁶

In Defence of Judaism

As usual, the apparent acceptance of the Greek language by the Jews is only part of the story. To begin with, consider how Judas Maccabaeus was fighting for, or to put it more simply, defending Judaism. There are various statements throughout the text that make this clear, most notably how Judas recruits only those who had remained faithful to Judaism.⁷ Moreover, it also seems clear that our author approved of Judas' objective.

⁵ We have discussed this elsewhere, but as an illustration of the point consider how even scholars who do not place much value on the text tend to do so by labelling it 'pathetic' or 'tragic' history, which in themselves were fashionable forms of Greek Historiography at this time (i.e. Second Century B.C.E.). Notice also how Rajak, for example, when comparing the authors of First and Second Maccabees observes that our author is the more Hellenised writer [(1990) 268]; and Goldstein (1983) 20ff, esp. n. 54. Some Aramaisms are listed in Grimm.

⁶ At this stage of Judaism's development at any rate. It is acknowledged that this situation can and does vary in different time periods. We have, for example, an indication that after 115-117 C.E. there was some sort of prohibition on the teaching of the Greek language, although this was a decree issued because of a special circumstance. In general the rabbis seemed to have no problem with Greek (language or wisdom) as long as it was not studied at the expense of the Torah: Cf. Feldman L.H. *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (Leiden, New York, Köln; 1996) 498-500 and the references to various rabbinical texts; however, note also Origen *Contra Celsum* II.34.

⁷ II Macc. VIII.1. This passage demonstrates the importance of Judaism to Judas' cause: 'Meanwhile, Judas Maccabaeus and those men with him secretly slipped into the villages summoning their kinsmen, and recruiting also those who had remained faithful to Judaism. All combined their numbers were at six thousand.' [Ιούδας δὲ ὁ Μακκαβαῖος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κώμας

There is no denigration, but rather a sense of tacit approval in the text of the importance of ensuring that Judaism flourishes. Consider that while Judas is not glorified in the way that occurs in First Maccabees, certain traditional aspects of Judaism (and therefore, if we recall our earlier discussion on Ἰουδαῖοι, Jewish identity) are regularly reinforced. At the very least this indicates authorial support for Judas' cause and identifies the defence of Judaism as a specific theme in Second Maccabees.

Let us be more specific by continuing our discussion on the importance of language. Our author while writing in Greek is not unaware of the integral role that language has to the identity of a people. Consider the account of the martyred mother and her seven sons, who defy the king's attempts to force them to break their traditional laws and, in particular, to eat pork.⁸ The family responds by retorting that they would die before submitting [II Macc. VII.2], a challenge which the king accepts [II Macc. VII.3], and one by one the family members are tortured and killed. As they go to their deaths they address the king and/or each other, defiantly rejecting attempts to get them to

προσεκαλοῦντο τοὺς συγγενεῖς, καὶ τοὺς μεμενηκότας ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ προσλαμβάνόμενοι συνήγαγον εἰς ἑξακισχιλίους]. Note that in First Maccabees the size of Judas' army is smaller, the number given is only three thousand: See I Macc. IV.6. For another indication that Judas was defending Judaism see our author's introduction to the text proper, i.e. II Macc. II.21. This is a topic covered by numerous scholars; see, for example, Rajak who observes that the changes introduced into Jerusalem were seen to be contravening Jewish Law [(1990) 262].

⁸ II Macc. VII.1-42. This is a story discussed by modern scholars in relation to its importance to the subject of martyrdom, it and that preceding it on Eleazar (II Macc. 18-31) are the earliest examples of 'monotheists suffering martyrdom and are the direct source for the patterns that thereafter prevailed in Jewish and Christian literature' Goldstein (1983) 282, note also 282-317. See Abel (1949) 365-384; Cohen G.D. 'The Story of Hannah and her Seven Sons In Hebrew Literature'. In *M. M. Kaplin Jubilee Volume* Hebrew Section (Jewish Theological Seminary of America: New York, 1953) 109-122; Frend W.H.C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Christian Church* (Doubleday: New York, 1967) 18-20, 34-37, 347, 414, 427-28; Hengel (1974) I.96, II.50; Momigliano (1975a) 86-87, Momigliano A. *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism* Edited with an Introduction by S. Bert. Translated by M.Masella-Gayley (University of Chicago: Chicago and London; 1994) 44-45; consider also Fourth Maccabees and Hadas M. *The Third and Fourth Book of Maccabees* Jewish Apocryphal Literature (New York, 1953). Finally, note Henten J. W. van and Avemarie F. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity* (Routledge: London, New York; 2002).

transgress their beliefs. At times in the account, in what can only be considered clear attempts to emphasise their piety and Jewish heritage, our author notes that they converse ‘in their ancestral language’ [τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ]. Consider, as an example of this, our author’s account of the mother’s resolve:

‘Υπεραγόντως δὲ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμαστὴ καὶ μνήμης ἀγαθῆς ἀξία, ἥτις ἀπολλυμένους υἱοὺς ἑπτὰ συνορώσα μιᾷς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας εὐψύχως ἔφερεν διὰ τὰς ἐπὶ Κύριον ἐλπίδας. ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλει τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ...

‘The exceedingly noble mother is also worthy of honourable remembrance; since she witnessed her seven sons being slain within the space of a single day, yet she bore it with a courageous spirit because of her faith in the Lord. She encouraged each of them [i.e. her sons] in her ancestral language ...’ [II Macc. VII.20-21]

It seems reasonable to assume that, for a Jewish reader, the mother’s use of her native/ancestral language adds to the nobility of the story, while also identifying her as Jewish and a follower of traditional law. While we cannot determine exactly what language our martyrs spoke – Hebrew or Aramaic – the point of the description was to emphasise difference. In this case the mother’s Jewishness is stressed: she is identified as being different from (perhaps, in the opinion of our author, ‘better than’) the king. The choice of language adds to this comparison.⁹ The same is true of the other two occasions

⁹ The use of one’s ‘ancestral language’ must be understood as a strong indicator of identity, consider our much earlier discussion on Ἰουδαῖοι. As to whether Hebrew or Aramaic is meant, I suspect the former – based on the strong religious nature of Second Maccabees. Consider how all the Pentateuch, work of the Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs, etc. were originally written in Hebrew – our author, although writing in Greek, provides allusions to some of these works (e.g. to Moses at II Macc. VII.7; Jeremiah at II Macc. XV.14; etc). Our author also identifies the Jews as ‘Hebrews’ in three places in Second Maccabees: II Macc. VII.31, XI.13, XV.37. Unfortunately none of these references relate in any way to the language. Be that as it may, we can not dismiss Aramaic, which was used for some religious texts (e.g. parts of Ezra [IV.8-VI.18, VII.12-26] and at least the additions to Daniel), and had been an important language in the region for many centuries (it was the ‘official’/administrative language of the Persian Empire). See Neusner et al. (1996) I. 52-4, 280; Pfeiffer (1948) 687, 761f, 812, 829, 832f; Schürer (1979) II.22-28. At any rate, both languages provide a link to the past (pre-Seleucid/Hellenic) and have ancestral associations. If this is not

that members of this family speak in their ancestral language.¹⁰ Moreover we also find references to the use of the Jews' own language at other places in Second Maccabees, such as when Judas encourages his soldiers before they confront Gorgias. On each occasion the introduction of the Jews' ancestral tongue appears to be in order to emphasise Jewishness and to draw a distinction against the (Hellenic) policies, armies, or individuals described.¹¹

This must lead to the conclusion that the Jews' 'ancestral language' is an important characteristic of Jewishness. Yet we have already demonstrated that the Greek language was, at the very least, not unacceptable to the Jews. To some extent this does present us with a dilemma, especially in the context of our previous discussions regarding the rejection of Greek culture. The content of our text, however, is clear: while the ancestral language of Judas, his followers, and the martyr woman and her sons is very clearly a marker of Jewish identity, Greek was an acceptable alternative at the time – at least in the educated circles to which we must assume our author and his audience belonged. In other words, while the use of Greek did not detract from one's Jewishness, the use of a language of historical, ancestral and traditional significance (i.e. probably Hebrew) emphasised it (at least in a literary context).¹²

the case then any objection or counter argument must explain why the actors in the story are described as employing another language.

¹⁰ II Macc. VII.8, 21, 27; at II Macc. VII.21 the mother exalted *each* of her sons in her own language.

¹¹ See, for example, II Macc. XII.37, where Judas sings hymns in his ancestral language on his way into battle and victory over Gorgias; or II Macc. XV.29 where the Jews discover Nicanor dead and sing praises to the Lord in their own language.

¹² And, perhaps in a very real way as well: consider how the Hasmonaeans used Hebrew script on coins and seals. This would have been done to provide legitimacy to their ancestral past. See, e.g. Meyers E.M. 'Jewish Culture in Greco-Roman Palestine'. In Biale D. [Ed.] *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (Shoken Books: New York, 2002)135-179 esp. 145. Note also that Josephus indicates that Hebrew remained his primary language; *Antiquities* XX.263; Feldman (1996) 500.

Other tensions (contradictions) are also evident in the text. One of the central themes of Second Maccabees, for example, is the unabashed promotion of ancestral laws and the need for strict adherence to them. On several occasions we receive examples of devout individuals who would rather die than violate their beliefs, or even be seen to violate their beliefs. Eleazar, for example, refused to comply with or even pretend to follow the king's directive to eat sacrificial meat. Our author then places a speech in the old man's mouth outlining the reasons for his defiance: a brave death will teach the young how to die a noble death for the Jews' revered and holy laws [II Macc. VI.23-29, esp. 27-28]. The defence of these traditional values (through e.g. Eleazar's speech) and the presence of divine intervention (e.g. the defence of the Temple against Heliodorus) demonstrate that Second Maccabees has a strong religious theme.¹³ This also indicates that for the Jews religion is an important factor in identity – being a Jew requires adherence to the laws and traditions of the past and following religious tenets. Our author is clearly concerned that some of these tenets are being eroded, a point evident by the special mention made of them.

To demonstrate this consider the four references our author makes to the Sabbath.¹⁴ On each occasion particular emphasis is placed on the Jewish desire to maintain the seventh day as holy in the face of the gentiles' efforts to eradicate it. This is perhaps best illustrated in Chapter Fifteen when Nicanor planned to attack the Jews on the Sabbath, but even the Jews that accompanied his army lobbied against such an action. The Jews assert that the Lord made the seventh day holy, while Nicanor argues that he is

¹³ II Macc. III.22ff. Heliodorus' assault on the Temple is the first attested miracle of the Second Temple, which in itself demonstrates the prominence of religion; see Goldstein (1983) 7.

¹⁴ The term Σάββατον (in its various forms) is found seven times in Second Maccabees [II Macc. V.25; VI.6; VIII.26, 27, 28; XII.38; XV.3]. The three references in Chapter Eight relate to the same episode. Other terms are used to refer to the Sabbath in the text such as 'Seventh [ἑβδόμητος] Day', e.g. II Macc. XV.4.

the one who wields the power on earth, not the Lord. There can be little doubt that Nicanor's words are designed to mark him as an arrogant sinner who deserves death (thereby foreshadowing events later in the chapter).¹⁵ Yet somehow (and we receive no indication why) Nicanor is unsuccessful in his bid to engage Judas on the Sabbath. While we can speculate *ad nauseam* as to what may or may not have happened, and contemplate various literary allusions and perhaps even symbolic inferences of who was really in control of events (and the world in general), there is one fact that is certain: the sanctity of the Sabbath is upheld.

In the context of our discussion of Ἰουδαῖοι our author's reinforcement of the Jews adherence to the Sabbath suggests that this is a ritual practice that marked a boundary. The Sabbath helps define 'Jewishness', so any erosion of the significance of that practice breaks down that boundary.¹⁶ Therefore religion is again demonstrated to be important to identity. This notwithstanding, there is another dimension to this discussion. First Maccabees makes it clear that this tradition (adherence to the Sabbath) had been discarded by some Jews: Mattathias (Judas' father) himself is presented as arguing that the Jews were justified in fighting on the Sabbath.¹⁷ The theological arguments aside, what this indicates is that in the Second Century B.C.E. there were some Jews who felt

¹⁵ See II Macc. XV.28ff: Nicanor is found dead by the victorious Jews.

¹⁶ Other such practices include circumcision, food laws (restrictions, etc.). For more insight see parts of Hendel's discussion: Hendel R.S. 'Israel Among The Nations: Biblical Culture in the Ancient Near East'. In Biale (2002) 43-75; esp. 58ff. That the Lord commanded that the seventh day be holy see, e.g. Leviticus XXIII.2-3. For more on the theological doctrines emphasised in Second Maccabees see Hengel (1974) I.96-97 and notes to the points raised (II. 49-50).

¹⁷ See I Macc. II.39-41 [Mattathias]; IX. 43-49 [Jonathan]. For more on Jewish laws concerning warfare on the Sabbath see Goldstein (1976) 237 and references cited therein. The differing accounts in First and Second Maccabees represent a discussion that was occurring between different Jewish factions at this time. It is a discussion that continues in the New Testament: see Mark II.23-27; Luke VI. 6-10; John V.5-18.

that they need not always observe the Sabbath (or more pointedly God's Law). The author of First Maccabees was probably providing a reason (albeit most likely retrospective) as to why this erosion of Jewish law had begun. In this context our author can be understood as providing an insight into a real concern and a societal debate. Moreover, our extensive discussion on our author's perception of Hellenism indicates who he thinks is responsible: The Greek presence is causing real change.

The relationship between Jewish religion and Hellenism is, however, more complex than the simple cause and effect scenario we have outlined. Consider once again our author's description of how the king sends Gentiles to compel the Jews to give up their ancestral laws [II Macc. VI.1ff]. After being told how the Temple was polluted and how the Jews had to give up their traditional festivals [II Macc. VI.3-6], we receive an interesting albeit derogatory description of how the Jews were forced to celebrate the feast of Dionysus and to wear ivy wreaths [II Macc. VI.7]. While there are several different Dionysiac festivals and Dionysus himself is a complex god, the sort of generic scene which our author probably intended to describe can be easily imagined. The usual Dionysiac festivals involved ivy wreaths (hence their specification in the text), the carrying and waving of a *θύρσος*, not to mention copious amounts of wine and intoxicated ecstasy.¹⁸

While drunkenness and revelry may be connected to any celebration (albeit their association with Dionysus and his festivals are more pertinent), the *θύρσος* and ivy are objects that are more distinctive. The direct association between ivy and the god is probably best demonstrated by Arrian's account of Alexander's visit to Nysa, a city which, its inhabitants argue, was founded by Dionysus [Arrian *Anabasis* V.1.5]. The Nysaeans' claim is accepted by the Macedonians in part because Mount Merus was

¹⁸ See, e.g. Burkert W. *Greek Religion* (Harvard University Press, 1985) esp. Pp. 161-7 and, e.g. Euripides *Bacchae*.

covered in ivy (this was proof enough that Dionysus had passed this way). In the subsequent celebrations the Macedonians sang hymns to Dionysus, made wreaths from the ivy, and crowning themselves with the vine celebrated with the usual Bacchic frenzy! Alexander even sacrificed to the god there.¹⁹ There can be little doubt that an association between ivy and Dionysus is implicit to the story. In addition to (and associated with) the ivy we also have to consider the θύρσος – an ivy-wreathed wand carried and waved by the worshippers of Dionysus. This θύρσος or wand is of particular interest to us. It is present in many different types of Dionysiac celebrations and can be considered a symbol of the god in the same way as, for example, Tyche has a wheel of Fortune. In fact the relationship is such that in art the θύρσος is used to identify Dionysus and his festivals.²⁰

That clarified, consider the description our author provides of Jewish participation in a Dionysiac festival. The context of this account is clear: it is part of a negative description whereby Jews were being compelled to reject their ancestral ways. Judaism was after all a strictly monotheistic religion so the rationale for Jewish objection is

¹⁹ Arrian *Anabasis* V.2.5-7. See Bosworth's comments supporting the ivy – Dionysus link: Bosworth A.B. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History Of Alexander* Volume Two: Commentary on Books IV-V (Oxford, 1995) 205ff esp. 206. Curtius also presents a similar story at Nysa – linking Father Liber (Dionysus), Ivy, and Bacchic celebrations [Curtius VIII.10.11-18]. Arrian is even more direct in the *Indica* where he leaves us in no doubt that the presence of ivy at Nysa is one of five or six observations that proves that Dionysus indeed passed that way [*Indica* V.9].

²⁰ See, e.g., Kerényi C.K. *Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life*. Translated by R. Manheim (London, 1976) who describes the θύρσος as a long staff carried by the worshippers of Dionysos [Pp. 180]; for the θύρσος associated with Dionysus usually through the interpretation of artwork see Pp. 200, 201, 218, 280, 313, 359, 369, 370, 375, 379, 380, 387; on Pp. 280 Dionysus is identified by the θύρσος. Burkert notes the association between Dionysus and the θύρσος as well; cf. (1985) 163, 166: 'The presence of Dionysus is announced by vine and ivy tendrils and by the thrysos, a springy wand (narthex) with a bundle of ivy leaves fastened to the top' [Pp. 166]. See also Euripides *Bacchae* 25, 80, 188, 240, 704, etc.; Dodds E.R. *Euripides Bacchae: Edited with Introduction and Commentary by E.R. Dodds* (Oxford, 1944) 78ff esp. note on *Bacchae* line 113 and references cited therein; and Leinieks V. *The City of Dionysos: A Study of Euripides' Bakchai* (Teubner: Stuttgart, 1996) 75-77, 83-84, 187-188.

obvious and does not need to be developed here. Be that as it may, let us consider the following description of a parade provided by our author a few chapters later:

Καὶ μετ' εὐφροσύνης ἦγον ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ σκηνωμάτων τρόπον, μνημονεύοντες ὥς πρὸ μικροῦ χρόνου τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἐορτὴν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι. δίο θύρσους καὶ κλάδους ὠραίους, ἔτι δε καὶ φοίνικας ἔχοντες, ὕμνους ἀνέφερον τῷ εὐοδώσαντι καθαρίσαι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον.

'And with joy they held celebrations for eight days in the manner of the Feast of Tabernacles, remembering that only a short time previous the festival of Tabernacles had been spent dwelling like wild animals in the mountains and in caves. Therefore, carrying ivy-wreathed wands [θύρσοι] and flowering branches and also palm fronds, they sang hymns for the successful cleansing of His Temple.'²¹

In simple terms this is nothing more than a description of a Jewish celebration dedicating and purifying the Temple. However, the language that our author chooses to use and the actions he ascribes to the participants of this celebration is puzzling. Our author categorically states that the Jews waved θύρσοι. In part the description of plants and branches does provide a link to the time spent dwelling in the wild (through δίο), but it still does not explain the choice of words. Given the familiarity that we have demonstrated our author has with Hellenic concepts, he cannot have been ignorant of the association the θύρσοι has to Dionysus, yet he still chose to use the term. The possible implications of this are wide ranging, but before reaching any conclusions let us see what else we can extract from the passage.

First, there can be no doubt that this is a Jewish festival. Its purpose is to celebrate the dedication and purification of the Temple, and it was similar to or at least comparable

²¹ II Macc. X.6-7. This passage has some difficulties and alternative readings (especially ἡὺχαρίστουν [i.e. praised/glorified] for ὕμνους ἀνέφερον). See Abel (1949) 408-9; Goldstein (1983) 380-81.

with the Feast of Tabernacles in some way.²² This parallel is interesting, not least because at the Feast of Tabernacles participants carried a *lulab*, which is a palm branch bound with myrtle and willow.²³ Greek observers would call this palm branch a θύρσος, but our author is not Greek or writing (primarily) for the Greeks – he knew the difference and we would expect him to make a distinction for his (Jewish) audience, which is exactly what we get. We are clearly informed that both palm fronds and θύρσοι are present.²⁴

So are we to ascertain a link between this very Jewish religious festival and Dionysus? This would be an extreme interpretation and most unlikely considering our author's demonstrable anti-Hellenic views (especially in relation to religion).²⁵ It seems more probable that the Jews, be it deliberately or subconsciously, have simply incorporated elements into their celebration that we associate with Dionysus. Our author finds nothing unusual in the practise because the rituals adopted and undertaken are done so voluntarily by the Jews and incorporated into a Jewish context. Whether or not the Dionysiac practices were actually adopted or just described in this way is not of concern; both are possible (and are not mutually exclusive), while either demonstrates a Hellenic

²² II Macc. X.5-8. The comparison to the Feast of Tabernacles is made directly by our author, but see also Goldstein (1983) 380.

²³ See Neusner et al. (1996) 391. The Jews are commanded to carry the *lulab* at Leviticus XXIII.40.

²⁴ II Macc. X.7: 'Therefore, carrying ivy-wreathed wands [θύρσοι] and flowering branches and also palm fronds ... [δὶο θύρσους καὶ κλάδους ὠραίους, ἔτι δε καὶ φοίνικας ἔχοντες ...] – emphasis added. Note that Plutarch has the Jews carrying θύρσοι during the Feast of Tabernacles and he makes a distinction between a θύρσος and other tree/palm branches [*Quaestiones Conviviales* IV.62 671e]. Admitably, Josephus also refers to the wands carried by the Jews at the Feast of Tabernacles as θύρσοι [*Antiquities* XIII.5 (372), but note description at *Antiquities* III (325)]. Consider also Josephus' intended audience, considering everything we have discussed so far it seems unlikely that our author was targeting a Greek 'readership'. See also Goldstein (1983) 381.

²⁵ For a connection between Dionysus and Judaism note Plutarch *Quaestiones Conviviales* IV.6 671C – 672C. Contra Tac. *Hist.* V.5, although Tacitus does associate ivy and vines with the Jewish Temple and we must consider that he is just simply hostile to anything and everything Jewish. Note also Neusner et al. (1996) 168; and Goldstein (1976) 129 esp. n. 154.

component (from an outside perspective) to Jewish religion.²⁶ This can, therefore be understood as an example of Tessa Rajak's 'Hellenisation process': The unconscious acculturation of Hellenic ideas as opposed to the hostility directed against symbolic Hellenism.²⁷ It also demonstrates how extensive this Hellenisation process was, it appears to have penetrated aspects of Jewish religion which to date has been central to the resistance of things Hellenic.²⁸ The inherent contradiction here seems to be governed by choice: The later celebration was developed by the Jews for themselves, while that described in the opening lines of Chapter Six [II Macc. VI.7] was imposed, almost certainly for political purposes.

Recognising Some Institutions of an Hellenic City

The points we have raised could be explained, to some extent, as literary constructs (i.e. not necessarily demonstrative of actual practices). To that end, we will now examine some of the Hellenic institutions and structures that may have been adopted by the Jews. Our objective is not to determine if Jerusalem was a πόλις at this time (although our insights may add something to that debate), but rather once again to try to

²⁶ In fact, it can be (and has been) argued that by creating a new festival commemorating the 'restoration of traditional Judaism the Maccabees departed from traditional Jewish practice and imitated their Hellenic enemies' [Meyers (2002) 145]. Despite the weakness of this view, our parallel to Dionysus provides some basis for the belief underpinning Meyers' assertion. Furthermore, recognising the infusion of Hellenic practices in Judaism goes some way toward countering Feldman's assertion that Jews did not 'develop syncretistic cults incorporating Greek elements' [(1996) 500].

²⁷ Rajak (1990) 261-280.

²⁸ This is an acceptance that must be emphasised. Hellenism in religion is what most commentators normally subscribe to as the explanation of Judas' rebellion and the line which Hellenic influence could not be allowed to cross: See e.g. Schürer 'Hellenism in its religious aspect was driven out of the Jewish region proper by the Maccabean uprising ...' [(1979) II 52]. The 'purity' of religion could, otherwise be used to explain the tension – Hellenic influence and change was fine except when it influenced Jewish religion. Our discussion, however, demonstrates that Greek concepts were accepted in religion – as one should actually expect: the segregation of aspects of one's identity is artificial.

understand the extent of Hellenisation that existed amongst the Jewish people.²⁹ Let us begin by considering a much discussed passage in Chapter Four where our author inveighs against the introduction of Hellenic Institutions. In short, what happens is that Jason outbids his brother (Onias) for the office of High Priest. Jason then seeks and gains permission from Antiochus Epiphanes to establish a gymnasium and a distinct civic class known as the *Antiochenes* [II Macc. IV.7-10]. Of course, our author fulminates against these changes suggesting that they represent the pinnacle of Hellenic influence. It should not surprise, therefore, that they also provide plenty of material for our author to use in his defence of (his) 'traditional Jewish society' [II Macc. IV.11-17].

Be that as it may, for us what is important is not our author's negative reaction to the perceived dramatic changes to Judaism (which is something that we have discussed extensively elsewhere), but rather the Hellenic institutions and citizen groups that are described. To focus on the rhetoric of our author alone would mean that we would miss some valuable insights into Jewish society at this time.³⁰ Consider the relevant passage:

Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ὑπισχνεῖτο καὶ ἕτερα διαγράφειν πεντήκοντα πρὸς τοῖς ἑκατόν, ἐὰν ἐπιχωρηθῇ διὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτοῦ γυμνάσιον καὶ ἐφηβίαν αὐτῷ συστήσασθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγράψαι.

In addition to these amounts he [Jason] promised to raise another 150 [talents] if provision could be made so that through his own office he [Jason] could establish a gymnasium and an 'ephebia' and that he [Jason] could register those who were *Antiochenes* in Jerusalem'.³¹

²⁹ On the question of whether Jerusalem was a Greek πόλις at this time see, in particular: Hengel (1974) I.74-75; Levine (1998) 39; Tcherikover (1959) 161-169; Tcherikover V. A. 'Was Jerusalem A "Polis"?'. In *IEF* 14 (1964) 61-78; Bickerman (1976) I. 239-40, (1979) 32-60 esp. 48; Grabbe (1992) 248-50; Schäfer (2003) 37; Schürer (1973) I.148-9, (1979) II.183, 197-198.

³⁰ See Gruen (1998) 29ff, who emphasises the need to look past the 'rhetorical smokescreen' [Pp. 30].

³¹ II Macc. IV.9. That we are talking about talents [τάλαντα] is made clear in the preceding lines [II Macc. IV.8]. This passage is also cited as a part of a much larger quotation earlier in this thesis and discussed there in a different context.

With these comments our author introduces us to several changes in Jewish society which require some comment. Let us begin with the obscure group our author calls the *Antiochenes*. Trying to identify just who these people were and the related issue of understanding correctly the phrase that introduces them to us has spawned a lively discussion amongst scholars in the later half of the twentieth century. The phrase that is at the centre of this debate is: τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγράφαι, which we have translated above, as ‘he [Jason] registered those who were *Antiochenes* in Jerusalem’. The alternative view is that all those in Jerusalem were registered as *Antiochenes* (‘those in Jerusalem he [Jason] registered as *Antiochenes*’).³² Through the translation we have presented we have made our preference clear³³, albeit we can accommodate both interpretations: First, the use of ἀναγράφω makes it clear that some sort of list was drawn up, which registered those who were to be classed as *Antiochenes*. It does not matter if the list incorporated just some or all the residents of Jerusalem. Second, as a consequence of the registration process a new social (perhaps even

³² See Bickerman who argues that Jason received permission to draw up a register of those who were *Antiochenes* in Jerusalem [(1937) 59ff], see also n. 33 below. The alternative translation is best presented by Tcherikover who argues that Jason received permission to enrol the citizens of Jerusalem as *Antiochenes* – whether that be understood as granting the same citizenship rights to the people of Jerusalem as those in Antioch; or the establishment of a new city of Antioch on the site (or near to) Jerusalem [(1959) 159, 404ff; see also Schürer (1973) I.148]. Most recently it is Bickerman’s arguments that have gained ascendancy (and it is his arguments which we have followed). Note also comments by Goldstein (1976) 111ff; Hengel (1974) I.73, II.184. These authors notwithstanding, there are still some who suggest that Jerusalem was simply renamed as Antioch: see e.g. Spek van der R.J. ‘The Babylonian City’. In A. Kuhrt et al. (1987) 73; Price S. ‘The Limits of Hellenisation’. In *The Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford, 1994) 315-337 (324). Some still interpret the passage in a vague way; Schäfer, for example, suggests that it was a registration of ‘the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch’ [(2003) 36] – an interpretation that can only be acceptable if ‘the inhabitants of Jerusalem’ are defined.

³³ In short, we have decided that the verb ἀναγράφω goes with the accusative τοὺς ... Ἀντιοχεῖς, so therefore the geographic location [ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις] must be a relative clause that is connected to the noun. As indicated this follows Bickerman and more recently Goldstein, q.v. This is the most straightforward interpretation of the Greek, and I fail to see why it should be understood any other way.

‘citizenship’) class was established that separated some Jews from others (regardless of whether the distinction is drawn amongst the people in Jerusalem itself (most likely) or between the citizens of Jerusalem/Antioch and the rest of Judaea). The label *Antiochenes* may have been given to an existing social class/group, or a new class may have been established.³⁴

Now, based on the name alone we can conclude that the *Antiochenes* are an Hellenic based group or, at least, very receptive to Greek based ideas. Moreover, they are not unique to Jerusalem. We have several inscriptions that indicate other cities in the Seleucid Empire were either renamed as Antioch or at least some of their inhabitants became known as *Antiochenes*.³⁵ It seems possible that Antiochus was attempting to unite

³⁴ Renaming an existing social class or group, or replacing current social labels would have created division in society (through the redefinition and obvious new balance of political power).

³⁵ Consider, for example, Antiocheia in Pisidia: see Schürer (1986) III.32; or Antiocheia on Callirhoe (Edessa): see Polybius V.21, Tcherikover (1959) 444. Note also Antiocheia of the Chrysaorians (Alabanda) which is generally taken as another Antioch. It is interesting in this later example that although the relevant decree refers to ‘the city of the Antiochenes of the Chrysaorian nation’ [... ἡ πόλις ἡ τῶν Ἀντιοχέων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Χρυσαιορέων ἔθνους], it also describes Antiochus as the benefactor of the *Antiochenes* and seems to address the *Antiochenes* as a distinct group within the wider community. Certainly they refer to themselves as a πόλις, but this is understandable in the context that their (i.e. the *Antiochenes*’) ambassador was representing them (the *Antiochenes*) in Greece, i.e. the πόλις could have been ‘renamed’ or identified as an Antioch on the strength of its dominant citizen class – the *Antiochenes*. Or, a city would seek to establish Hellenic institutions (gymnasium, etc.), draw up a citizenship list and so establish a πόλις constitution, which could result in a name change for the city when the new ‘citizens’ had consolidated their control of a city or merged sufficiently with the indigenous population (or perhaps more correctly the section of the population still following traditional customs). This process is perhaps seen in an inscription from Phrygia [Jonnes L. and Rici M. ‘A New Royal Inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyriaion the Status of a *Polis*’. In *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29 (1997) 1-29, note comments Pp. 11] and could be what we see starting to happen in Jerusalem [I owe the reference to Jonnes et al. and the possible link to Jerusalem as a πόλις to Prof. Fergus Millar who was kind enough to discuss some of these issues with me in September 2002. Of course the theory I have outlined here and, in particular, any inconsistencies with it are entirely my own fault]. For more on this decree on the Antiocheia of the Chrysaorians, including copy, translation and comments see Ma J. *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford, 2000) 212-213, 305-308. On Antiocheia of the Chrysaorians just being the new name given to Alabanda by Antiochus III see, e.g. Jones (1940) 15. There are other indications of the idea of *Antiochenes* being a class in or a part of a particular city, consider for example coins of Ptolemais struck under Antiochus IV bearing

his vast geographic and diverse empire with a very identifiable and prominent citizenship class. The *Antiochenes* was to be the name for those who had Seleucid citizenship, a group in itself that is perhaps best understood in comparison to Roman citizens.³⁶ The interest for us, however, is that analogous to the establishment of this citizen class is the introduction of some very Greek institutions, such as the gymnasium and the ephebic education system. Certainly the 'Greekness' of the institutions are emphasised, but should we take this as indicating that each operated exactly as if they were in Athens?³⁷ At the gymnasium, for example, did all attendees follow the Greek custom and exercise naked?³⁸ Certainly the author of First Maccabees and also Josephus both assert that they

the Greek legend 'Antiochenes in Ptolemais': see Goldstein (1976) 113, 115; Tcherikover (1959) 92: although note Tcherikover's objections to the citizenship theory on Pp. 443-444 (n. 12). Regardless of how we choose to interpret the *Antiochenes* of Second Maccabees it is clear that they are a sector of Jewish society connected with Hellenism (a point obvious just by the name).

³⁶ For more on this possibility see Goldstein [(1976) 104-60 esp. 110-122, (1983) 227] who writes strongly in support of understanding the *Antiochenes* in this way. See comments in previous footnote as well. The possibility that the *Antiochenes* were intended to be a citizenship class for the Seleucid Empire is perhaps made even more plausible if we recall that Antiochus IV spent sometime as a hostage in Rome [Appian XI.7.38-39; Polybius XXI.17.8-11; Goldstein (1976) 197] and seems to have adopted some very Roman practices [Polybius XXVI.1, XXX 25.3, 6 and 26.1; Livy XLI.20.1-4, 9-13; Goldstein (1976) 104ff]. The suggestions we have made open up plenty of further questions that simply cannot be addressed here, such as: How would this Seleucid Citizenship work in practice? Would *Antiochenes* have political rights in Antioch? Paul's Roman citizenship (which he uses to his advantage) does not affect his legal rights in Judaea, would Seleucid citizenship operate in the same way?

³⁷ Consider the description of the wearing of the *petasos*: [II Macc. IV.12]; and a more direct indication of the establishment of an ephebic institution [II Macc. IV.9]. Harris in his study argues that the wearing of the *petasos* in this account is a metaphor for 'coming under Greek influence' [Harris *Greek Athletics and the Jews* (Cardiff, 1976) 31]. There is also reference to a gong that signalled the opening of the gymnasium [II Macc. IV.14]. The use of an audible signal to open a gymnasium is mentioned by Cicero [*De Oratore* II.5.21]; note also comments and references in Goldstein (1983) 231. However, we should note that if we translate this passage literally the attraction seems to be the discus, yet as Harris points out the throwing of the discus did not take place in the palaestra – there was simply not enough space [(1976) 31]. A possible solution is that the discus was perceived as very Greek. That Antiochus thought Athens was the pinnacle of Hellenism is made clear at II Macc. IX.15 and through the use of an Athenian at II Macc. VI.1ff. We should also not forget that Antiochus spent some time in the city.

³⁸ On the Greek gymnasium see, e.g. Jones (1940) 221-6; see also Thucydides I.6 (below).

not only did, but they even attempted to hide their circumcisions.³⁹ If this is so then what we are presented with is evidence of a major rejection of traditional Jewish values and the adoption of Greek ones.⁴⁰

While these passages are compelling they also present us with a dilemma. The possibility of naked Jewish priests and young men running around in the gymnasium would provide a spectacular opportunity for our author to criticise the influence of those he perceives as 'Hellenisers' even more, yet he is silent on the issue.⁴¹ This suggests that the Jews were not in fact exercising naked, a view that (in turn) is consistent with what we know about Eastern cultures at this time⁴², and the Jews in particular. Adam and Eve, for example, are naked without shame only in the pristine Garden of Eden. Later, after they had sinned, they were aware of their nakedness and from that time had to be clothed.⁴³ Thucydides notes that the Greeks only began exercising naked in recent times

³⁹ I Macc. I.14-15: ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας. Supported by Josephus *Antiquities* XII 5.1 (241), albeit Josephus used First Maccabees as a source. Note also Schürer (1973) I.148-9, esp. n. 28.

⁴⁰ The importance of circumcision is made clear by, e.g. Genesis XVII.9-14; XXI.4, etc.

⁴¹ In fact, we would not only expect our author to mention naked Jews, but to also exaggerate their presence and immoral practices (in the context that they are violating the law as laid down by the Torah). This point is also noted by Gruen (1998) 38; Goldstein (1983) 229-30.

⁴² Consider, for example, Herodotus' comment in the Gyges story: 'For among the Lydians, and nearly all other Barbarian races also, it is held as a great shame even for a man to be seen naked [παρὰ γὰρ τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖσιν ἄλλοισι βαρβάροισι, καὶ ἄνδρα ὀφθῆναι γυμνὸν ἐς αἰσχύνην μεγάλην φέρει] [Herodotus I.10]. Compare also the story of how Agesilaus strips Persian prisoners to sell as slaves and reveals that they were soft and white because they always wore clothes: Cf. Xenophon *Hellenica* III.4.18; Plutarch *Agesilaus* IX.5.

⁴³ See Genesis II.25 and III.7 respectively. The author of Jubilees interprets the Biblical account of God clothing Adam to mean that nudity is prohibited [cf. Jubilees III.26ff]. Furthermore, direct negative comparison is also made with the practices of the gentiles [Jubilees III.31]. See Wintermute O.S. 'Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction'. In J.H. Charlesworth [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol. Two (Doubleday: New York, 1985) 35-142.

and that Barbarians – especially those in Asia – still wore loin cloths.⁴⁴ Plato expresses a very similar idea to Thucydides’ in the *Republic*.⁴⁵

Combined this evidence is compelling and militates against the accounts in First Maccabees and Josephus. However, despite initial appearances both representations are not necessarily mutually exclusive. To begin, the silence of Second Maccabees probably does mean that the Jews who used the gymnasium did so clothed.⁴⁶ The problem of nudity can be understood as something that happened later and was projected back by the author of First Maccabees – a scenario that incidentally confirms the relative chronology of the Maccabaeon Books that we proposed earlier.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ See Thucydides I.5-6: ‘In earlier times even at the Olympic games, the athletes wore a girdle (loincloth) over their genitals when competing, and it is not many years since they stopped doing this. Indeed even now there are some among the Barbarians, especially among those in Asia, when prizes in wrestling and boxing are contested the participants wear loincloths’ [τὸ δὲ πάλαι καὶ ἐν τῷ ολυμπικῷ ἀγῶνι διαζώματα ἔχοντες περὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα οἱ ἀθληταὶ ἡγωνίζοντο, καὶ οὐ πολλὰ ἔτη ἐπειδὴ πέπαινται· ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἔστιν οἷς νῦν, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς Ἀσιανοῖς, πυγμῆς καὶ πάλης ἄθλα τίθεται, καὶ διεζωμένοι τοῦτο δρῶσιν]. Gomme comments on when the transition to exercising naked may have occurred, after all ‘in earlier times’ is very vague [Gomme (1945) I.103-6]. We must acknowledge, of course, that Thucydides was writing some 150 years before the Maccabaeon conflict (and Herodotus was even earlier), but Jubilees (and even First Maccabees and Josephus) confirm that the social pressure opposing nudity was still important. See also comments by Golden M. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1998) who advocates for the Greeks exercising naked from the early Fifth Century B.C.E. [Pp. 66]; and Crowther N.B. ‘Athletic Dress and Nudity in Greek Athletics’ In *Eranos* 80 (1982) 163-168.

⁴⁵ Plato *Republic* V.452 C-D. Note also Jubilees III.30-31 which condemns the idea of Jews going naked as the gentiles do; although to be fair for such a comment to be made we must accept the possibility that it was in response to some instances of Jewish nakedness. Of course it could also be pre-emptive, to remind Jews of what God’s Law specifies in order to prevent them from transgressing it. This is how Goldstein understands the passage: cf. (1981) 77-78, (1983) 230.

⁴⁶ This is the belief that seems to have gained ascendancy amongst most modern commentators. See, e.g. Goldstein (1981) 77-78, (1983) 229-30; Gruen (1993) 259, (1998) 30; Harris (1976) 29-31.

⁴⁷ Jewish society demonstrably became more ‘Hellenised’ under the Hasmonaeans and the account in First Maccabees may represent the Hellenisers attempting to push the boundaries even further, albeit at a date much later than the events that we are concerned with. Gruen’s assertion that ‘the hiding of circumcisions’ as described in First Maccabees actually refers to Antiochus IV’s later persecutions is unconvincing: it still does not account for our author’s silence who would surely have commented on it in his account of that episode. See Gruen (1998) 30, 259.

Be that as it may, there is another related dimension to this interpretation. While our author is scathing with regard to the use of the gymnasium (or the extent of use, when and by whom), he is not concerned with the gymnasium itself. Nowhere do we hear about its destruction, yet if it had been such a significant symbol of Hellenistic excess that lured priests from their holy duties, surely our author would take great delight in detailing its demise, stone by stone.⁴⁸ This recognition, especially when combined with our nudity discussion, demonstrates (again) the adoption and adaptation of aspects of Hellenic culture. The gymnasium itself was accepted by the Jews (it was not destroyed), its use was initially adapted as the locals wore loin cloths (although later this may have changed). Certainly aspects of this institution earned criticism (when it interfered with the duties of priests), but so long as it remained within the boundaries of the Jewish belief system the silence of our author seems to indicate that even Hellenic concepts could be adopted.

Moreover, this is not an isolated example. Consider the delegation that Jason sends to Tyre with three hundred silver drachmas as a sacrifice for Herakles [II Macc. IV.18-20]. The opening phrase makes it clear that all had gathered to attend the quinquennial games – a very Greek event.⁴⁹ Our author makes no comment about this fact or the Jewish attendance: this part of the narrative is presented as though it was a normal acceptable occurrence. In the same way the use of Greek coin [δραχμή] is passed over in silence: our author is not even slightly perturbed. On both matters this is hardly what we would expect from an author raging against Hellenisation, unless the Jews themselves

⁴⁸ A point also noted by Gruen, who uses it to emphasise that Hellenism and Judaism were not in conflict at this time. See Gruen (1998) 29-31.

⁴⁹ II Macc. IV.18: 'When everyone gathered together for the quinquennial games in Tyre' [Ἀγομένου δὲ πενταετηρικοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐν Τύρῳ].

accepted this festival as part of their cultural celebrations and had adopted the δραχμή because it benefited them.⁵⁰

*Towards An Explanation Of The
Hellenism vs Judaism Contradiction*

From this study we can be left in no doubt that not everything 'Hellenic' was shunned or criticised by the Jews, a contradiction that perhaps goes some way towards qualifying the various viewpoints and interpretations that modern scholars have expressed in regard to Second Maccabees. We are still left, however, with the unenviable task of trying to address and to interpret the opposing views. Again we must reiterate that any solutions are speculative, but as we shall see the tension between these interpretations can be explained through the differences between perceptions, reality, self-identity and individual control of one's destiny – distinctions we have already recognised.

Let us begin with one issue that the text makes very clear. In short, when we discuss Jews, Judaism (or for that matter try to define 'Ιουδαῖοι) we are not talking about one homogenous group. There were clearly different factions within Jewish society at this time. We have, for example, the *Antiochenes* which were obviously a Greek or Hellenised group of Jews involved in the introduction of Greek institutions such as the ephebes and the gymnasium [II Macc. IV. 7-17]. There is also the large army that Judas raised to defend Judaism, which in itself was comprised of several groups such as the Hasidim.⁵¹ There are the different families such as the Tobiads [II Macc. III.11]; pro-Ptolemaic and pro-Seleucid factions hinted at [II Macc. X.12-13]; not to mention the

⁵⁰ These are additional examples of Rajak's 'Hellenisation process' as opposed to the symbolic imposition of Hellenism [(1990) 261-280]. What our author does take exception to in this passage is the attempt to give the drachmas as a sacrifice to Herakles [II Macc. IV.18-20].

⁵¹ II Macc. XIV.6; see also I Macc. VII. 7-12 and comments by Gruen (1998) 8-9; Efron (1987) 22-27; Tcherikover (1959) 196-98.

word choices and usage we have identified that demonstrates that this factionalisation is fundamental in understanding the text.⁵² The point is that all of these factions are of a significant size and influence in Jewish society at this time. Amongst the hostile rhetoric that our author directs against the 'Hellenists', for example, we also learn that the 'Hellenic' changes were implemented by the High Priest. This demonstrates that a significant faction in the priestly class saw no conflict in the changes that were occurring or at least a way to adapt traditional Jewish life to the new Hellenic ideas and activities. This is a situation that, upon reflection, should not surprise. Adjusting to a new political environment and 'a reaching out to gentiles in the vicinity' are understandable societal reactions. This does not necessitate an outright abandonment of traditional laws and the holy covenant. Rather, it just confirms that some Jews considered the Hellenic institutions perfectly acceptable or adaptable to their own purposes in a Jewish context.⁵³

⁵² Examples supporting both these assertions can be found throughout this thesis and should require no further evidence to be cited here. It is also widely acknowledged, either directly or indirectly, by modern scholars that Jewish society was factionalised at this time. It is the politics of the different factions that can go some way to explaining the events in the Maccabean Books. See, e.g. Harris (1976) 31-2; Schürer refers to a 'pro-Greek' faction and the 'rest' see e.g. (1973) I.148; Gruen notes several Jewish groups, see e.g. (1998) 28; Schubert K. 'A Divided Faith: Jewish Religious Parties and Sects'. In A.J. Toynbee [Ed.] *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith* (Thames and Hudson: London, 1969) 77-98. Schäfer segregates Jewish society in terms of Pro-Seleucid and Pro-Ptolemaic factions [(2003) esp. 13-63]. It is possible that the *Antiochenes* were comprised of Jewish families who had gained prominence, wealth and power from the time that Judaea was considered Ptolemaic territory. Some may have benefited from the change of overlordship from the Ptolemies to Seleucids or just the Hellenistic environment itself, such as the Tobiads; see II Macc. III.11 (notice how he is still held in high regard, although it is interesting that Josephus has the 'sons of Tobias' among those who seek permission to build the gymnasium: Josephus *Antiquities* XII.5.1 (237-241); Harris (1976) 30); Goldstein (1975) 85-123, (1983) 207-209; Schäfer (2003) 18-21, 32-41 esp. 35ff; Tcherikover (1959) 159-60. What the example of this Jewish family should make clear is all that some Jews were probably trying to do was to make the most of the world they found themselves in and, where possible, to manipulate events – all for their own benefit and within the boundaries (as they perceived them) of their own society. Even Judas Maccabaeus made agreements with Seleucid officials when it suited his cause [see II Macc. Chapter XI.15 (and the letters) and Gruen (1998) 28]; as did the Hasmonaeans, consider e.g. the political manoeuvring between Jonathan, Alexander and Demetrius: cf. I Macc. 10.1ff; and Jonathan's approaches to Rome and the Spartans: cf. I Macc. XII.1ff.

⁵³ Gruen (1998) 29-31; Meyers (2002) 144.

On the other hand, of course, there were those that objected to the changes, although some scholars have tried to minimise the validity of this faction by criticising the text as propaganda or dismissing the opposition as an insignificant group of hard-liners.⁵⁴ This, however, is not a reasonable deduction, our text suggests that there were a significant number of Jews that had adopted an anti-Hellenism stand. The first observation must be the widespread acceptance of Second Maccabees itself and (notably) that it is an extant text. We would expect that if it was the ranting of an extreme group of conservatives it would not have been preserved; or, if by some quirk of fate it did survive, it would not have been mentioned by early mainstream Christian writers.⁵⁵ Second, Judas gathered enough support not only to face Seleucid military power, but to defeat it. While the exact size of Judas' army is disputed (the numbers our author gives are clearly and

⁵⁴ Consider, for example, the title of Doran's book: *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of Second Maccabees*. Goldstein argues that Jason (and our author) set out to 'prove' the holiness of the Second Temple [(1983) 16] and discredit the author of First Maccabees whom he labels as the Hasmonaean propagandist [(1983) 17ff]. While Gruen advocates: 'The rhetoric of II Maccabees should not lead us astray. Its author has vastly overrated a crisis that few at the time seem to have found particularly alarming.' And a little latter: 'The installation of a gymnasium at Jerusalem certainly meant introducing Greek ways, but the idea that this entailed abandonment of the holy covenant (even though some hard-liners may have propounded it) is wild exaggeration'. Emphasis added in both quotes, and both can be found at Gruen (1998) 29. Some scholars do acknowledge that the resistance must have been sizeable, but only in passing and with no elaboration. See, e.g. Bright (1981) 423: 'Not a few, however, refused compliance and stiffened their backs to passive resistance' [emphasis added].

⁵⁵ Clement of Alexandria refers to Second Maccabees as the 'abridgement of the Maccabaeon Histories' [*Stromateis* V. 14.97], note also I. 21.123]; Origen also refers to The Maccabaeon Histories [*Contra Celsum* VIII.46]; see Goldstein (1976) 3-4, (1983) 3-4; Abel (1949) viii-x. Christianity was, after all greatly influenced by Hellenism – or perhaps more correctly arose out of an era, area and belief system dominated by Judaism and Hellenism. This is a debate that we do not need to get into here, but see by way of introduction to the topic: Toynbee A. 'The Mediterranean World's Age of Agony: The Historical Antecedents'. In A.J. Toynbee [Ed.] *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith* (Thames and Hudson: London, 1969) 19-46 – note: 'Twin roots determined the character and moulded the history of Christianity – the Jewish and the Graeco-Roman. Both formed an essential part of the synthesis of the new religion ...' [Pp. 20]; Hengel M. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* Translated by J. Bowden (London, 1983); Harris E. *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity* (New York, 1957).

deliberately low), we must remember that these figures will not in themselves represent the totality of Judas' support. Farmers in heartland Judaea, for example, must have aided Judas, not to mention the nameless women who must have supported their husbands, brothers and sons.⁵⁶ Third, there are several texts that appear at this time that take a similar position to our author over the role of gentiles in destroying Jewish society. First Maccabees is an obvious example, but consider also the Book of Daniel (early to mid second century B.C.E) and the writings of Ben Sira (late third century to early second century B.C.E.).⁵⁷ Combined these points demonstrate that this was a group of significant size and with a diverse support base.

⁵⁶ The numerical strength of armies provided by our ancient sources is consistently inaccurate. In short, the figures are a way to indicate power relationships, tactics and topographical matters – all of which affect military encounters but are harder to quantify. The respective size of each army can also exaggerate the importance of a victory and help minimise or explain the reason for a defeat. There seems little doubt that the authors of First and Second Maccabees could and did magnify the glory of the Jewish victory over the Seleucids by minimising the numbers in Judas' army and exaggerating the strength of his foe. The numbers given in the Maccabaeen texts range from 6000 at the start of the revolt [II Macc. VIII.1, 16, 21-22] to 10 000 at the battle of Beth Zur [I Macc. IV.29]. More informative are the reports in First Maccabees that Judas led 8000 men to Gilad while 3000 followed Simon [I Macc. V.20], while the remainder of the army was left under the commander of Joseph and Azaria in order to defend Judaea. It has been estimated that the size of this later force must have been at least equal in number to the totals that had departed under Judas and Simon, i.e. 11 000; giving a total Jewish military strength of 22 000. Some support is provided by the Temple Scroll which stipulates that a tenth, a fifth, a third, or in great emergencies a half of the army can be sent out, but to avert the possibility of any invasion at least half the military must remain in Judaea [see "The Temple Scroll" (IIQT=IIQ19, 20, 4Q365a) LVIII; Vermes (1998) 190-219]. The "War Scroll" also provides some indication on Jewish force numbers, which support the sort of military figures we have suggested above. According to this scroll somewhere between 10600 and 11600 would advance into battle [IQM, I Q33, 4Q491-7, 4Q471; Section V-VI: see Vermes (1998) 161-183, esp. 168-169]. For more on the numerical strength of Judas' army, including further references and other theories supporting the number of 22 000 see especially Bar-Kochva (1989) 29-67, especially 47-63 (Jewish numbers) and 63-67 (reasons for distorting numbers). Further references and some additional, related comments can be found in Kasher A. 'Changes in Manpower and Ethnic Composition of the Hasmonaean Army'. In *Jewish Quarterly Review* Vol. 81 (1991a) 325-352, esp. 334-337. Non-military residents of Judaea could have provided support through the provision of food and shelter, and/or more abstract in the form of boosts to morale, etc. Bar-Kochva, for one, also agrees that Judas' army probably had the support of local farmers [(1989) 58].

⁵⁷ To name two as indicative examples only, not an exhaustive list. Consider also that we are only dealing with extant texts and it is probable that many more that support our interpretation existed in antiquity.

The recognition of different factions in Jewish society and the conflict that was occurring among them can explain the divergent views towards Hellenism that we have identified in the text of Second Maccabees. The book can be seen as a microcosm of the tension and debate concerning the change that was occurring in Jewish society at this time. More interesting though is the possibility that these different factions would hold different ideas about how to adapt to the emerging socio-economic and political climate. This difference of opinion created friction both between Jewish groups (factions) and between the Jews and other peoples (gentiles, but particularly Hellenes). 'The most visible sign of the changes are the symbols of the Hellenised ruling power (albeit in conjunction with some Jews) such as the gymnasium. It must have seemed most disconcerting for some Jews to have priests hurrying away from the Temple to partake in foreign (Hellenic) practices. The result would have been a feeling amongst the Jews that a new identity was being imposed. This can provide a reason why our author blamed Hellenism for eroding traditional Jewish beliefs: it was symbolic of the 'new order' and the direction in which Jewish society was evolving.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that in many ways these policies mirror those of the colonial powers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries C.E: difference is feared and conformity demanded, among other things, in order to maintain control for the new ruling elite.⁵⁸ For the minority groups involved (or, to remain focussed on our era and

⁵⁸ This is not the place to embark on a detailed comparison, but it is worthwhile noting that (if treated with care) we could gain some insights into the events in Jerusalem in the second century B.C.E. by examining the actions and rationale of colonising powers in more modern eras. See, e.g. Townsend M.E. *European Colonial Expansion Since 1871* (Chicago, Philadelphia, New York; 1941) esp. 'Results of European Expansion upon the Native' Pp. 183-210 which describes the policies of the colonial powers towards indigenous peoples in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries – all cases demonstrate a power imbalance, although this is not always apparent to Townsend herself; Stoler A.L. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 2001) – which, although focussing on issues of intimacy and sex, does discuss and evaluate colonial studies and cultural anthropology especially at the start of Chapter Two: Cf. Pp. 22-26, 224-229.

topic, 'for the Jews'), such cultural and societal changes result in alienation and powerlessness. This, in turn, means that to maintain some influence over one's identity there was a reaction against the perceived threat. So for our author's Jewish faction everything Greek was demonised in order to make the point that we (as Jews) are different and want to protect who we are: it was easier and more effective to do this before the façade of an all consuming, hostile other.⁵⁹

Therefore, in relation to our discussion on Second Maccabees, it seems reasonable to suggest that Hellenism was the chosen way to categorise the other. As anecdotal and undoubtedly factual stories came to light of what the Seleucids had done and were doing, Greek practices were further demonised and an idealistic traditional life without or before Hellenism created. A cycle of cause and effect was therefore established, and blame meted out based on these beliefs. Perception becomes integral in explaining daily reality, so foreign imposed changes to Judaism were perceived to be the fault of the Greeks, while Hellenic practices adopted by the Jews through choice were, or could become, part

The issues Stoler raises with regard to sex between coloniser and colonised are in themselves interesting and relevant to the Jewish society we are discussing with its restrictions on marrying foreigners – but that is another study again. See also references raised in the Introduction to this thesis.

Other aspects of cultural anthropology can also be informative. We can gain the same insights into power imbalance by studying the conflict in terms of a relationship between an ethnic group (in our case the Jews) and a political power elite. See e.g. Enloe (1973) *passim*; Ronen (1986) 1-10. See also recent investigations into post-colonialism which tend to draw attention to the need for recognition and respect between groups – not to mention self-awareness. Such recognition in itself requires the existence of previous power imbalances. See, e.g. Ashcroft B. *Postcolonial Transformation* (Routledge: London and New York; 2001); Loomba A. *Colonialism/Post-Colonialism* (Routledge: London and New York; 1998); Seshadri-Crooks K. 'At the Margins of Post-Colonial Studies Part I' and Afzal-Khan F. 'Part II'. In F. Afzal-Khan and K. Seshadri-Crooks *The Pre Occupation with Postcolonial Studies* (Duke University Press: Durham, London; 2000) 3-34. Such policies are also evident (to some extent) in the Ancient World through the recognition by the ruling power of traditional laws of different groups (see II Macc. XI. 16-38 – a series of letters granting the Jews the right to follow their own laws, although there is still a power imbalance to suggest that this indicates a degree of autonomy and ability to define one's self).

⁵⁹ Therefore, as we mentioned in the 'Introduction' to this thesis, as this text is part of the literature of that group of Jews rebelling against change (i.e. the 'other') it provides good material for identifying and defining Jewishness ('us') – definite values will be emphasised to draw a distinction.

of their (traditional) identity. The line between the acceptance and rejection of Hellenic concepts was placed in a different place by the different factions in Jewish society.

In addition there is an underlying point: power and control. For our author Hellenic culture was cultivated as the villain responsible for social change, so it became a convenient catch cry in order to rally support. That this message may have been passed to supporters in Greek did not seem hypocritical because the Jews had chosen to use this language. In other words, choice and the power explicit in making that choice meant that the Greek language had become an acceptable part of traditional Jewish society (to some extent and/or in some circumstances) from the perspective of the Jews. Try as they might the High priests Jason and Menelaus could not garner the same degree of support for their agenda.

We may make bold to venture a moral: Societies will change and evolve, but it must be from within that group even if the stimulus is external. Imposition of change will meet resistance. When a combination of these two circumstances exist an outsider looking in can identify what appear to be contradictory messages when in reality they are nothing more than one group of people making choices. In the case of the period that we are here concerned with, this can most graphically be illustrated by the events following Judas' success. The conflict against the Seleucids built on the need to defend Judaism from Hellenism, yet the subsequent Hasmonaean dynasty is the most responsible for Hellenising Jewish society.⁶⁰ It can be argued, however, that the difference is choice. Under the Hasmonaean Jews controlled the introduction of Hellenism. In this way, cultural change could be moulded into terms acceptable to the majority and not be symbolic of the other or imposed by foreigners.

⁶⁰ A topic that has received extensive attention in its own right. See, as an introduction to this subject: Bickerman (1962) esp. 148-165; Schürer (1979) II.52.

*

*

*

We can conclude, therefore, that the adoption of Hellenic practices and the maintenance of traditional Jewish values are not necessarily mutually exclusive concepts and/or actions.⁶¹ The use of the Greek language to promote a Jewish message demonstrates this quite clearly. It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that there was some form of Jewish acceptance, perhaps even adoption of the Greek language as an appropriate part of Jewish tradition. Certainly, there may have been a practical purpose as well. The Jews were, by the Second Century B.C.E., spread over many parts of the Mediterranean; from Alexandria to Babylon, to Sardis and many places in between. Greek was a language that could reach all of them and enable (even empower) all Jews to understand and to contemplate traditional Judaism. Of course in the ideal world this would be done through Hebrew, but the reality required the use of Greek.⁶² Moreover, albeit probably as an unintended by-product, it was a way to teach – or perhaps to enlighten – gentiles not only as to the existence of Jews, but also to introduce concepts of Judaism to them. This would have the added benefit of validating the Jews' own, unique identity.

The underlying principle of self-interest and control is perhaps the most important point to take out of this discussion. The 'traditional Jews' could use the Greek language for their benefit to enhance their position. On this basis other aspects of Hellenistic life could also be adopted without compromising identity. In short we cannot escape the simple fact that the Jews themselves (or at least a significant segment of their society)

⁶¹ Also recognised by Rajak (1990) 261-280.

⁶² This is the reason now advocated by most scholars for the translation of Jewish Law (i.e. Pentateuch) into Greek. See, e.g. Bickerman (1962) 74; Schürer (1986) III.475; Tcherikover (1959) 348.

found aspects of Hellenism acceptable. We are hardly in the position to tell them that they are wrong or that their reality does not fit some neat modern model!

This observation leads us directly to our final point. We must consider the perspective through which we have made these assessments. As outsiders trying to present an image of Jewish society as it is depicted by the text of Second Maccabees we can label different attributes as Hellenic through the criteria we established earlier in this thesis. The reality for a Jew living in this world could be (and would have been) something completely different. Aspects of Jewish identity that we label Hellenic would have been incorporated into Jewish identity as an acceptable attribute and not perceived as alien by the Jews. The use of Greek is an obvious example. We can perhaps label it as an indicator of Hellenic influence, but for a Jew at that time it was just a part of normal, everyday life. In the same way, the existence of the gymnasium and an ephebic class do not mean that Jerusalem was a (Greek) πόλις.⁶³ The institutions can be adopted and adapted to fit Jewish requirements. It is in this way that we can state that Judaism and Hellenism were not mutually exclusive. In fact, in an interesting twist, it seems that it was the perception of the latter's role in challenging Jewish society that helped ensure the survival of a distinct Jewish identity.

⁶³ In the sense that the presence of these institutions in themselves do not necessarily make it a Greek πόλις, it is of course still a 'city' in the more generic understanding of the term.

Conclusion

There can be no doubt that in the middle of the Second Century B.C.E. a sector of Jewish society, as represented by our author, was in a political and cultural struggle for the control of Judaea (in particular Jerusalem). Its initial opposition came from among its own countrymen, a significant faction who believed that the future of Jewish society was best served by a strict alliance with the ruling Seleucids. To achieve this alliance – and their own political ambitions – they took a very liberal view of the traditional laws as prescribed by the Torah and lobbied strongly for Jewish acceptance of foreign customs. These actions bring the cultural aspects of the political struggle to the fore. This is what the author of Second Maccabees focuses on. He alleges that foreign influences were threatening ‘Jewishness’ itself, they were challenging the unique attributes that defined Jewish identity. In making this stand and advocating traditional Jewish customs our author makes two points abundantly clear. First, the primary, albeit not exclusive, concern for him is religion. Second, the threat to Judaism (which we can understand as Jewish identity/Jewishness) is specified: he calls it ‘Hellenism’.

It is the second of these conclusions that will be the most controversial. As we made clear at the beginning of this analysis (and at several places during it) most modern commentators have begun to minimise, to the point of denying, any conflict between Judaism and Hellenism, Greek and Jew.¹ Nevertheless, we have consistently demonstrated that our author, while advocating Judaism, is defining the traditional Jewish way of life against the Hellene and the customs he perceives are associated with the Greeks (i.e. Hellenism). In places our author explicitly makes this contrast. He, for

¹ As indicative authors see Goldstein’s various works, and Gruen – especially his *Heritage and Hellenism*. More references are cited in the Introduction. The traditional interpretation of the Maccabaeon Books recognises the Greek versus Jew, Judaism versus Hellenism dimension.

example, expresses direct concern with the effect the gymnasium, ephebia and Hellenism (a term he specifically uses) were having on Jewish traditions – in particular the priests' activities [III Macc. IV.9-17]. Consider also that at the start of Chapter Six it is the Hellenes (under an Athenian) that are perceived as denigrating the Temple, implementing Antiochus IV's edict, and persecuting the Jews [II Macc. VI.1ff]. Certainly there is a political aspect to these accounts.² However, it is the socio-religious/cultural aspects of the descriptions that interest us the most. To that end, our analysis has demonstrated that our author not only expresses concern with regard to that which he labels Hellenic, he also tends to focus on how Hellenism and the actions of the Hellenes are threatening Judaism.

Our interpretation is further supported by our analysis of the more subjective elements identifiable in Second Maccabees, specifically our author's perceptions as we have been able to identify them in the text (or subtext). It is clear that for the Jews the Seleucids are representative of (or perhaps even perceived 'as') the Hellenes and are symbolic of Hellenism.³ Understanding that, we can see that the surrounding nations can be (to some extent) linked to the Greeks and Hellenism through their Seleucid commanders, as can the role(s) and choices of the various neighbouring cities in supporting Seleucid decrees. While simple geography can explain the prominence with which local cities or nations have in Judas' campaigns, it is not the surrounding nations themselves that are of principal concern to our author. Rather it is their association with

² We have commented how Second Maccabees could provide political insights or how it could enhance our understanding of the various Jewish factions clearly competing for control of Jerusalem. The text also incorporates valuable glimpses into the role(s) of the Seleucids and Ptolemies.

³ To make use of Tessa Rajak's definition of Hellenism [(1990) 261-280].

the imposition of Hellenic based customs, even if this association is indirect.⁴ This is a (if not the) primary reason, as emphasised by our author, for Judas' actions. Be that as it may it is also possible that Judas was in fact the aggressor. We can interpret our author's version of events as indicating that Judas may have used the perceived threat of Hellenism to mask his own political and expansionist ambitions.

The way we approached the text (or to use the jargon we have introduced, our more 'subjective' analysis of it) revealed other indications of our author's anti-Hellenic perspective. Our study on the names of the actors in Second Maccabees [Chapter Seven] identified a strong correlation between Greek-named individuals and acts that are considered hostile to the Jews. Characters with Hebrew names, on the other hand, were generally portrayed in a positive way. Since it is doubtful that the book was deliberately constructed in this way, what we seem to have identified is an indication of our author's perceptions and beliefs: In other words, a reflection of the way he saw the world around him. It seems that, rightly or wrongly, he blamed Hellenism and the Hellenes for the dilemmas Judaism and the Jews were facing at this time.

This underlying perception was evident in all our studies, and it is this repetition that is significant. To put it simply, the combined recognition of the same basic theme makes it more convincing and presents us with a basic context or environment that should be considered fundamental in any analysis of the text. This notwithstanding, we also took our discussion one stage further. We demonstrated that in Second Maccabees the Greeks and what they represent are constructed as the 'other', outside Jewish society and different. Now, what is interesting (and something that is, perhaps, a qualification to our

⁴ This interpretation is in no way intended to minimise the importance of these nations' traditional enmity to the Jews. Tradition is important to our author, and he is presenting the threat in terms that he and his fellow citizens can understand and relate to. While reference to traditional enemies is undoubtedly one such method, we have shown that the invasive, destructive Greek presence is another.

observations), is that it is the 'differences' that our author seems to focus on – both when we have made a direct or objective interpretation of the text, and when we have made a subjective one. Let us be a little more specific. These differences are, for the most part, cultural practices that are not accepted by our author as being a part of Jewish society. Most importantly when our author recognises a difference, which he regularly constructs as a threat, he tends to label it 'Hellenism'. In doing this, what he is actually creating is a rallying cry or an all inclusive catch-phrase that encompasses all of the threats facing the Jews. The Hellenes and all things Hellenic, become *perceived* as the source of all problems for the Jews. In this way Hellenism represents hostility and negativity, with nothing constructive to offer – or such is the belief, regardless of the reality.

The implications of this last observation are interesting. It provides the rationale to explain why Hellenism can be condemned, while on the other hand various Hellenic customs can be and are willingly adopted by the Jews into their own environment. In our analysis we described this apparent contradiction as a 'tension', and explained it through the interaction of a variety of factors such as perception and reality; power, choice and control [Chapter Eight]. Further insights can be gained by examining more recent episodes of colonisation – while the circumstances are clearly different, some of the underlying principles are similar. The key issue is identified as power: if one makes the choice to adopt a practice it is not being imposed nor is it a threat. In this way, practices or customs that *we* may label as Hellenic can be accepted by the Jews. Furthermore, by being incorporated into their daily lives these customs or practices become, in a sense, a part of Jewishness.⁵ As a result, regardless of the attempts that have been made to rationalise what we are interpreting as a contradiction, our study has identified that the

⁵ So the Greek language has a place or acceptable role in Jewish society (Second Maccabees itself was written in Greek!), and Dionysus' *θύσος* can be waved at Jewish religious festivals [II Macc. X. 6-7]; but Hellenism itself can be condemned on high: esp. II Macc. IV.7-17; VI.1ff.

differing perspectives on Hellenism simply reflect the daily reality. Therefore, in any analysis of the Jews and the Greeks / Hellenism and Judaism, as represented in Second Maccabees, there will be examples of Hellenic customs being accepted, while others are loudly denounced. We cannot ignore this fact, rather we must undertake studies in a similar vein to this one, that attempt to find a way to account for apparent contradictions – or, to put it more simply, the complex realities inherent in any society.

* * *

We could end our discussion at this point, having summed up our assessment of one of the more complex issues raised by Second Maccabees. However, to do so would misrepresent both a fundamental purpose of our study and the value(s) of the insights that we have made. For a start, the description of events we have outlined (above) is taken from the various discussions and points that we have raised throughout our study. It is, I believe, a reasonable interpretation of our text and a probable scenario. Yet it is not intended to be, nor is it presented as, the definitive answer to the question whether the Jews opposed the Greeks or the alleged threat to Judaism by Hellenism. Rather, it is an interpretation based on a method. To that end, one does not have to agree with the outline of events provided to appreciate the way in which our results were gathered, analysed, and assessed. Furthermore, our conclusion does not have to be accepted in order to recognise the importance that texts, such as Second Maccabees, can have in enriching our understanding of particular eras and episodes in History.

Let us be a little more specific. We introduced Second Maccabees as a text from the genre of tragic or pathetic history. Such labelling has been used to denigrate the book's content and it has resulted in scholars' tending to treat it as secondary to First Maccabees, except (of course!) where Second Maccabees could add more to a particular argument or to a point important to an author's own reconstruction of events. It appears that this assessment is based on the relative amount of objective, explicit facts: First

Maccabees provides details of events in a way that we find more acceptable. Yet it is the fact that Second Maccabees is an opinionated work with a specific purpose that makes it invaluable to us. It is a product of a time and place and the analysis of context, meanings, assumptions and the use of particular words can provide an insight into our author's perceptions and his (and his readers') version of reality. This recognition enabled us to analyse the (subjective) elements of the text and endeavour to interpret them in order to open up new insights.⁶ One focus was (as discussed) things 'Hellenic', another (albeit related) is identity – in particular Jewishness. We based our discussion on two principal components. First, the criteria arising from a debate on identity that was clearly occurring in the ancient world: consider, for example, the factors emphasised by Herodotus in his well known description of the Hellene.⁷ Second, we looked at the definitions derived from recent work in the social sciences.⁸ From this starting point we developed our analysis by focussing on particular words, authorial insertions, omissions, group identification, and the reasons why events were included and how they were included. In short, we made assumptions about our author's audience's beliefs based on the hypothesis that they would have to be able both to understand and to relate to the text in some way (whether it be in a positive or negative way). This, in turn, also meant that we could make assumptions about the criteria that identified groups – or more specifically Jews. All of these points made it clear that identity was a social construct that was fluid: Jewishness, for our author, had become more reliant on cultural criteria (specifically, but not exclusively, religion) and could not be defined solely in ethnic and/or geographic

⁶ A method advocated as the best way to progress our understanding of the Maccabaeen books by at least one other scholar: See Rajak (2001) 3-10, esp. 6.

⁷ See (in particular, but not exclusively) Herodotus *Histories* VIII.144; and Chapter One.

⁸ An extensive list of references and a definition of 'ethnicity' (in particular) are provided in the Introduction.

terms.⁹ We were also able to show that this evolution preceded our text, which in turn suggested that: First, our author's opinions were consistent with significant factions in Jewish society at the time (i.e. the ideas presented were part of an ongoing societal debate). Second, the evolution that saw culture dominating identity criteria developed earlier than some scholars have indicated.¹⁰

Furthermore, our study revealed plenty of other details concerning the Jews in the Second Century B.C.E. It became clear that in order to study Jewishness, and in particular the criteria relevant to Jewish identity, we invariably had to examine what our author perceived as not being Jewish or what was foreign. Our method was to establish some of the criteria that defined or at least categorised elements thereby enabling us to quantify identity. This was done through a study of the other. Modern social scientists have long acknowledged the importance of the other in defining one's self, while Hartog (for one) demonstrated the possibilities this concept presents (in relation to the ancient world at least) with his analysis of Hellenic identity based on the *Histories* of Herodotus.¹¹ We applied some of the same principles to our study of Second Maccabees and, in doing so, recognised that the 'other' against which the Jews define themselves is

⁹ Of course, ethnicity and geography remained criteria considered in relation to identity – but our analysis indicated that they became less important and were 'manipulated' if problematic. In relation to the importance of religion, it seems equally likely that the emphasis on this criterion was enhanced for political purposes. For more see Friese [(2002) 10ff], especially in relation to the studies in the fourth part of his volume ['Boundaries and Ethnicity']. Consider also the definition and relevance of the term *ethnopolitics*: see Bauman (2002) 189-200, esp. 197-98 n. 4.

¹⁰ Cohen suggests that Ἰουδαῖοι can be first translated as Jews in a cultural/religious sense in Second Maccabees [(1999) 92-3]. We have demonstrated that the transition process predates Second Maccabees. See Chapter Two.

¹¹ Hence the title of Hartog's book: *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Other scholars have adopted the concept as well: recall the comments made by Edith Hall in the preface to her book *Inventing the Barbarian* and cited in our 'Introduction' [(1989) ix].

clearly the Hellenes – or (to be more specific) the ‘other’ is perceived as, and on occasion labelled as, the Hellene.

While the Jewish-Hellenic dichotomy was a consistent theme throughout our analysis of Second Maccabees, we can also reflect on some of the results arising from each of the distinctive case-studies that we have undertaken.¹² After all, the investigations we have made into specific aspects of Second Maccabees are done in a way that has not previously been attempted. If the points we discuss are raised by other scholars – such as the names of characters – they are done so in general terms that seem to reflect (support) a particular argument as opposed to assessing what is actually portrayed in the text itself. As we noted a little earlier, we demonstrated in Chapter Seven that names are a reflection of identity and do tend to indicate whether an actor is pro- or anti- Hellenism or at least to represent something of our author’s attitude towards Hellenism. There are, of course, complicating factors and exceptions. But with Hebrew-named characters undertaking pro-Jewish actions and Greek-named individuals (regardless of ethnicity) at some point acting against the Jews (e.g. Jason, Menelaus) or failing in a task (e.g. Dositheus and Sosipater), there is quite clearly more to one’s name (for our author at least) than has been recognised to date.¹³

In the same way Chapters Three, Four, and Six are examinations of specific terms – i.e. Ἰουδαῖοι and λαός, Ἕλληνες, and ἔθνος respectively – and how our author utilises them in Second Maccabees. Each study demonstrates how we should interpret the term when we read Second Maccabees, and indicates possible insinuations that our author could be making when he uses a particular word: λαός, for example, referred

¹² In general terms each Chapter represents a separate study, although Chapters One and Two are more introductory; Chapter Three has two related studies (Ἰουδαῖοι and λαός); while Chapters Five and Six are also related.

¹³ Contrast, for example, our discussion on names with that by Gruen (1998) 31ff.

exclusively to the Jews and was usually used in a religious context; while Ἰουδαῖοι and Ἕλληνες are demonstrably defined in terms of customs (culture) and tend to be contrasted. We used this information in relation to deciphering 'Jewishness' and societal beliefs, but it is also important for studies into Greek versions of Hebrew (Biblical) texts. The way our author uses λαός and ἔθνος, for example, tends to parallel the Hebrew use of *'am* and *goy*.

Our analysis of the other nations (and to an extent ἔθνος) also presents us with another way of understanding the text.¹⁴ Instead of making generalisations on how some of the nations are the traditional enemies of the Jews, or that Judas fought against the surrounding nations and not Hellenism, we identified the actual nations or peoples that our author refers to in the course of Second Maccabees. We ascertained our author's attitude to each group of people by looking at details of each account and placing it in the context of the work as a whole. These observations provided extensive detail, analysis of which suggested that we should be more cautious in accepting some of the more recent interpretations of the text. It became clear, for example, that there were more distant nations than surrounding nations mentioned in the text; and that, of the peoples we categorised as negative, fewer were to 'surrounding nations' than to Hellenic groups!¹⁵ Furthermore, mention of 'other nations', in particular the 'surrounding nations', are predominantly clustered in two Chapters in Second Maccabees and not spread throughout the text.¹⁶

There can be little doubt that both these factors strongly militate against the hypothesis that Judas' principal concern was the surrounding nations. Further verification

¹⁴ See Chapters Five and Six, respectively.

¹⁵ See Chapter Five and Appendix Two.

¹⁶ Specifically II Macc. IV and XII. See Chapter Four.

was provided by our author's use of ἔθνος. This analysis recognised that ἔθνος was best understood in a broader conceptual way, specifically in relation to 'us and them'. It was not a term that was used exclusively to represent any one group (be it the 'surrounding nations', the Jews, or the Hellenes, etc.), but its use did tend to be associated with identity. We found that in relation to foreign ('other') ἔθνη there was a strong association to Hellenism. In hindsight though I wonder if this should really cause surprise. After all, the basic story of Second Maccabees is of a rebellion: the Jews rejected the policies and customs of their Seleucid (= Hellenic) ruler. In relation to the Jews no one specific pattern was identifiable, although there was some indication that ἔθνος was an all inclusive term that transcended social and political factions.¹⁷ There was also the possibility that our author's use of ἔθνος could provide some insight into his methodology (or how the text was later edited): several uses of ἔθνος are in letters or stories that lend themselves to direct copying.¹⁸

All these various observations notwithstanding, perhaps the most important point we can take from this entire study is the process that we used. Certainly there was more than an element of speculation in several of our assessments. However, the repeated patterns – such as the hostility to concepts labelled and identifiable as Hellenic¹⁹ – minimise any irregularities (exceptions) that may have occurred in regard to individual cases. These repeated patterns also make it more probable that we have identified a belief or perception of at least our author, but more probably a section of society. After all

¹⁷ Also supported by how our author used related terms such as ὁμοεθνέω [e.g. II Macc. XV.30, 31] and ὁμόγυλος [e.g. II Macc. IV.10]; and phrases such as 'all the people of Judaea' [τὸ πᾶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ... γένος] [II Macc. VII.9].

¹⁸ E.g. the account of Eleazar [II Macc. VI.18-31].

¹⁹ Consider our study on the Ἕλληνες in Second Maccabees [Chapter Four], the other nations in Second Maccabees [Chapter Five], ἔθνος in Second Maccabees [Chapter Six], and our analysis of names and actions [Chapter Seven].

without some degree of acceptance this work would not be extant – it had to appeal in order to be read, copied and passed on. This suggests that our analysis can cut across the artificial constructs that we traditionally impose in order to understand events. This does not mean that we should not continue to undertake our usual investigations and assessments. Rather, it simply provides a word of caution: daily realities are complex and many of the issues that we discuss will not be simple extremes, but will consist of multi-dimensional, interrelated elements.

There can be little doubt that this way of analysing texts makes assessment and interpretation more difficult. Yet, if nothing else, we have shown that to understand events and societies we have to look beyond the objective, explicit accounts in the text to more subjective ideas. The resultant complexity offers compensation through a more in-depth and far richer understanding not only of the text, but of the society which produced it. Our acknowledgement, for example, of the Hellene as the other while demonstrating that the Jews adopted Hellenic customs – i.e. the ‘tension’ we analysed at Chapter Eight – is precisely the sort of complexity meant. Finally, accepting that Jewish society could and did both accept and reject elements of Hellenic culture advances our understanding of that society.

This last point is an observation that encapsulates much of what we have endeavoured to establish in the course of our study and, for that reason alone, is worth emphasising as we bring our discussion to a close. In short, if we look around at the divergent views and contradictions that are a part of the communities in which we live today we can see that society is complex. This is the nature of societies and peoples, regardless of the time and space within which they exist. Our study has attempted to recognise and account for that fact. To reiterate, the correct context is the best way to approach divergent accounts or representations in this (or any) text. It is hoped that by

using the type of method we have presented and asking the sort of questions that we have, there is the possibility that we will be able to present a more accurate reflection of daily reality, of societies, and of life in the ancient world. Be that as it may, in the end all we have actually suggested is a way in which addressing these sorts of issues may be done. Hopefully in the process we have added to the understanding of Second Maccabees and its representation of Jewish society.

Appendix One:

Ἰουδαῖοι

In Second Maccabees¹

Number	Reference	Word	Comment
1	I.1	Ἰουδαίοις	
2	I.1	Ἰουδαῖοι	
3	I.1	Ἰουδαίας	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
4	I.7	Ἰουδαῖοι	
5	I.10	Ἰουδαίᾱ	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
6	I.10	Ἰουδαίοις	
7	II.21	Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ	Judaism
8	III.32	Ἰουδαίων	
9	IV.11	Ἰουδαίοις	
10	IV.35	Ἰουδαῖοι	
11	IV.36	Ἰουδαῖοι	
12	V.11	Ἰουδαίαν	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
13	V.23	Ἰουδαίους	
14	V.25	Ἰουδαίους	
15	VI.1	Ἰουδαίους	
16	VI.6	Ἰουδαῖον	
17	VI.8	Ἰουδαίων	
18	VIII.1	Ἰουδαϊσμῷ	Judaism
19	VIII.9	Ἰουδαίας	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
20	VIII.10	Ἰουδαίων	
21	VIII.11	Ἰουδαίων	
22	VIII.32	Ἰουδαίους	
23	VIII.34	Ἰουδαίων	
24	VIII.36	Ἰουδαίους	

¹ Some variation of how many times Ἰουδαῖοι appears could arise depending on which text is used (we noted differences, for example, in our manuscripts at II Macc. X.14, see Chapter Three n. 14). For searching we have used the CD Rom: *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (University of California, 1999) and Rahlfs’ edition of the text. The two pre fixed letters are included in this study.

The column headings are self explanatory: Number – keeps a running total of the number of entries; Reference – the relevant entries; Word – the form of Ἰουδαῖοι found at each reference; Comments – any notes, in particular if the form of Ἰουδαῖοι refers to the geographic area of Judaea or if we have a form translated as Judaism.

Related References to ‘Hebrews’ [VII.31; XI.13, XV.37]; ‘Israel’ [I.25, 26; IX.5; X.38; XI.6]; and ‘Jerusalem’ [I.1, 10; III.6, 9, 37; IV.9; V.25; VI.2; VIII.31, 36; IX.4; X.15; XI.5, 8; XII.9, 29, 31, 43; XIV.23, 27; XV.30] are not included.

25	VIII.36	'Ιουδαίους	
26	IX.4	'Ιουδαίους	
27	IX.4	'Ιουδαίων	
28	IX.7	'Ιουδαίους	
29	IX.15	'Ιουδαίους	
30	IX.17	'Ιουδαίων	
31	IX.18	'Ιουδαίους	
32	IX.19	'Ιουδαίοις	
33	X.8	'Ιουδαίων	
34	X.12	'Ιουδαίους	
35	X.14	'Ιουδαίους	
36	X.15	'Ιουδαίους	
37	X.24	'Ιουδαίων	
38	X.24	'Ιουδαίαν	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
39	X.29	'Ιουδαίων	
40	XI.2	'Ιουδαίους	
41	XI.5	'Ιουδαίαν	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
42	XI.15	'Ιουδαίων	
43	XI.16	'Ιουδαίοις	
44	XI.16	'Ιουδαίων	
45	XI.24	'Ιουδαίους	
46	XI.27	'Ιουδαίων	
47	XI.27	'Ιουδαίοις	
48	XI.31	'Ιουδαίους	
49	XI.34	'Ιουδαίων	
50	XII.1	'Ιουδαίοι	
51	XII.3	'Ιουδαίους	
52	XII.8	'Ιουδαίοις	
53	XII.17	'Ιουδαίους	
54	XII.30	'Ιουδαίων	
55	XII.34	'Ιουδαίων	
56	XII.40	'Ιουδαίους	
57	XIII.1	'Ιουδαίαν	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
58	XIII.9	'Ιουδαίοις	
59	XIII.13	'Ιουδαίαν	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
60	XIII.18	'Ιουδαίων	
61	XIII.19	'Ιουδαίων	
62	XIII.21	'Ιουδαϊκῆς	
63	XIII.23	'Ιουδαίους	
64	XIV.5	'Ιουδαίοι	
65	XIV.6	'Ιουδαίων	Hasidaean Jews led by Judas.
66	XIV.12	'Ιουδαίας	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
67	XIV.14	'Ιουδαίας	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.
68	XIV.14	'Ιουδαίων	
69	XIV.37	'Ιουδαίων	

70	XIV.38	Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ	Judaism
71	XIV.38	Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ	Judaism
72	XIV.39	Ἰουδαίους	
73	XV.2	Ἰουδαίων	
74	XV.12	Ἰουδαίων	
75	XV.22	Ἰουδαίας	Refers to the geographic area of Judaea, not the people.

Appendix Two

The Surrounding Nations

Table One:
A Complete Listing of All References
To Peoples and Places
In Second Maccabees¹

Entry No	Reference	People/Place	Pos	Neg	Desc	Comments
1	I.1	Egypt			D	Jews in Egypt, recipients of letter.
2	I.10	Egypt			D	Jews in Egypt, recipiants of letter.
3	I.13	Persia			D	King Antiochus entered Persia with a force that seemed invincible.
4	I.19	Persia			D	Jewish forefathers carried off into Persia.
5	I.20	Persia			D	King of Persia.
6	I.33	Persia			D	King of Persia.
7	II.23	Cyrene			D	Jason of Cyrene.
8	III.3	Asia			D	Seleucus, King of Asia.
9	III.5	Coele-Syria Phoenicia			D	
10	IV.4	Coele-Syria Phoenicia			D	
11	IV.9	Antiochenes		N		Whomever this term actually refers to, it is clear our author associates them with Hellenism and views them as part of the threat to Judaism.
12	IV.10	Hellenic/ Greek		N		
13	IV.11	Romans	P			Treaty of friendship and an alliance established.
14	IV.13	Hellenism		N		Not really a ‘people’, but strongly associated to the ‘Greeks’ (a term for ‘Greek customs’?) and a concept central to our thesis, so we have included it.
15	IV.15	Hellenic / Greek		N		
16	IV.18	Tyre			D	Games held at Tyre.
17	IV.19	Antiochenes		N		Delegation from Jerusalem to Tyre were Antiochenes.

¹ Column headings are described at the end of this table.

18	IV.21	Egypt			D	
19	IV.21	Joppa			D	
20	IV.22	Phoenicia			D	
21	IV.26	Ammonite		N		Jason sought refuge here, so the Ammonites support an enemy of Judaism.
22	IV.29	Cypriots			D	
23	IV.30	Tarsus	P			Inhabitants of this city rose in revolt against Antiochus.
24	IV.30	Mallus	P			Inhabitants of this city rose in revolt against Antiochus.
25	IV.32	Tyre			D	Menelaus sold gold plate from the Temple to the inhabitants of Tyre and other surrounding cities.
26	IV.33	Daphne			D	Onias withdrew to the Sanctuary at Daphne near Antioch.
27	IV.33	Antioch			D	
28	IV.36	Cilicia			D	
29	IV.36	Greeks		N		See discussion in Chapter Four and, especially, Chapter Six from n. 49ff and text, this thesis.
30	IV.44	Tyre			D	
31	IV.47	Scythians			D	The Scythians are understood to be 'uncivilised', in this context they are used to denigrate Antiochus and Menelaus further.
32	IV.49	Tyre	P			People from Tyre support Jewish outrage against Antiochus' actions, but note the use of καὶ [even], which could indicate we have the same situation as IV.36 and the apparent Greek support.
33	V.1	Egypt			D	
34	V.7	Ammonite			D	Jason seeks asylum in Ammonite territory.
35	V.8	Arabs	P			Imprisoned Jason, enemy of the Jewish people.
36	V.8	Egypt			D	
37	V.9	Spartans		N		Generally seen as positive owing to a mention of kinship with the Jews. However, the context is of Jason fleeing the Jews and finding a place of refuge here: so despite their 'kinship' the Spartans support an enemy of Judaism!
38	V.11	Egypt			D	
39	V.21	Antioch			D	
40	V.22	Phrygia		(N)	D	Philip is described as a Phrygian and as Barbarous!
41	V.23	Mt Gerizim			D	

42	V.24	Mysian		N		Mysian Mercenaries slaughter Jews on the Sabbath.
43	VI.1	Athenian		N		Sent by Antiochus to instruct Jews to give up ancestral customs.
44	VI.2	Mt Gerizim			D	
45	VI.8	Neighbouring Greek cities		N		Hellenic / Greek residents of these cities to compel the Jews to reject ancestral customs.
46	VI.9	Hellenic / Greeks		N		Jews must conform to Greek ways.
47	VIII.8	Coele-Syria Phoenicia			D	
48	VIII.10	Romans			D	
49	VIII.20	Babylon			D	Battle in Babylon under Semacherib against the Galatians.
50	VIII.20	Galatians			D	The opponents in the Battle (above; VIII.20)
51	VIII.20	Macedonians		N		The Macedonians were on the same side as the Jews in a battle in Babylonia against the Galatians but were fewer in number and not as effective. Part of an historical account.
52	VIII.20	Macedonians		N		The Macedonians were on the same side as the Jews in a battle (above; VIII.20) but did not fight effectively because they were 'perplexed'! Second mention in same passage.
53	VIII.35	Antioch			D	
54	VIII.36	Romans			D	
55	IX.1ff	Persians	P			Defeated Antiochus in battle.
56	IX.2	Persepolis			D	
57	IX.3	Ecbatana			D	
58	IX.15	Athens			D	Antiochus would give the Jews rights equal to the citizens of Athens.
59	IX.21	Persia			D	
60	IX.29	Egypt			D	
61	X.11	Coele-Syria Phoenicia			D	
62	X.13	Cyprus			D	
63	X.15	Idumeans		N		Attacked Jews.
64	X.16	Idumeans		N		Attacked by Judas.
65	X.24	Asia		N		Timotheus gathered a multitude of Foreign Forces out of Asia.
66	X.32	Gazara		N		Harboured Timotheus, described as Blasphemers.
67	XI.2	Hellenes		N		Jerusalem was to become a settlement for the Greeks / Gentiles!
68	XI.5	Bethrusa	P			City in Judaea that resisted Lysias' assault.
69	XI.24	Greek Ways		N		Adopting Greek customs was problematic for

						the Jews as it would mean violating aspects of Jewish law.
70	XI.34	Romans			D	Senders of Letter to the Jews.
71	XI.34	Romans	P			Acting on behalf of Jews.
72	XII.2	Cypriots		(N)	D	Nicanor, chief of the Cypriot mercenaries. Prevented the Jews from leading a tranquil/peaceful life.
73	XII.3	Joppa		N		Residents of this town drowned at least 200 Jews.
74	XII.8	Jamnia		N		Residents of Jamnia planned similar atrocities against their local population of Jews as were committed by the people of Joppa (XII.3).
75	XII.9	Jamnia			D	Judas attacks Jamnia, based on the above [XII.8] allegations.
76	XII.10	Arabs		N		Arabs attack the Jews.
77	XII.11	Arabs	P			Arabs seek a peace treaty after being defeated by Judas. Referred to in text as νομάδες [Numidians/Nomads]. This is the only time in Second Maccabees that this term is used and the Arabs are clearly meant, so we have included the reference.
78	XII.13	Caspin		(N)	D	Judas attacks the town of Caspin that has a mixed population of Gentiles. The Caspians are rude to Judas, but this seems to be after he is committed to the attack!
79	XII.15	Jericho			D	Analogy to great deeds in the past.
80	XII.17ff	Charax		(N)	D	Judas comes to Charax and attacks, forces are left here by Timotheus. It is a stronghold of the "Tubian Jews". Town destroyed by Judas' generals. Later, a Turbian Jew is on the side of Judas (XII.35) – although he fails at his task.
81	XII.21	Carnaim		(N)	D	City where Timotheus sends women and children and supplies.
82	XII.26	Carnaim		(N)	D	Judas slaughters twenty-five thousand people when he takes the city
83	XII.27	Ephron		(N)	D	Town with a mixture of nationalities defend themselves from Judas' attack – Judas succeeds, however, as the Lord is on his side and again kills twenty-five thousand of the defenders.
84	XII.29	Scythopolis		(N)	D	Judas marches against this town (see below, XII.30).
85	XII.30	Scythopolis	(P)		D	The Jews living here testify to the goodwill of the local inhabitants. So they are spared so long as they continue their good will.

86	XII.32	Idumean			D	Judas marched against Gorgias the General of the Idumean territory.
87	XII.35	Thracian		N		A Thracian horseman struck Dositheus, who at the time had hold of Gorgias.
88	XII.35	Marisa			D	
89	XII.38	Adullam	P			Town Judas rested in on the Sabbath.
90	XII.40	Jaminites		N		The Jews that were slain had idols of the Jaminites under their cloaks.
91	XIII.2	Hellenic / Greek		N		Antiochus Eupator marched against Judas with a large Greek force.
92	XIII.4	Beroea			D	
93	XIII.14	Modin			D	Where Judas pitched camp.
94	XIII.19	Bethrusa	P			A Jewish fort which the king attacks and is defeated.
95	XIII.22	Bethrusa			D	
96	XIII.23	Antioch			D	
97	XIII.24	Ptolemais to Gera			D	Hegemonides left as Governor of this territory.
98	XIII.25	Ptolemais			D	
99	XIII.26	Antioch			D	
100	XIV.1	Tripolis			D	
101	XIV.16	Adasa			D	
102	XIV.27	Antioch			D	
103	XV.1	Samaria			D	
104	XV.36	Syrian			D	

The column headings are self explanatory:

Entry No. Keeps a running total of the number of entries;

Reference The relevant passage from the text;

People/Place Every group of people or place name mentioned in the text;

Pos, Neg, Desc Each entry is classified as Positive, Negative, or Descriptive from the perspective of our author and based on the context of the account in Second Maccabees. Descriptive entries can also have a bracketed P or N i.e. [P] / [N] indicating tending toward positive or negative respectively;

Comments Any additional notes or information that could be beneficial.

Table Two
Individual Nations and Places²

Entry No	People / Place	Location	References	Comments
1	Egypt	D	I.1, 10; IV.21; V.1, 8, 11; IX.29	
2	Persia	D	I.13, 19, 20, 33; IX.1ff, 21	
3	Cyrene	D	II.23	
4	Asia	D	III.3; X.24	
5	Coele-Syria and Phoenicia	D	III.5; IV.4; VIII.8; X.11	
6	Antiochenes	S	IV.9, 19	
7	Greek / Hellenic	S (D)	IV.10, 13, 15, 36; VI.8, 9; XI.2, 24; XIII.2	See Table in Chapter Four: "Ελληνες In Second Maccabees. Categorised as 'Special' because of the cultural focus of some references – otherwise, of course, they would be labelled 'Distant'.
8	Romans	D	IV.11; VIII.10, 36; XI.34, 34	
9	Tyre	C	IV.18, 32, 44, 49	
10	Joppa	C	IV.21; XII.3	
11	Phoenicia	C	IV.22	
12	Ammonites	C	IV.26; V.7	
13	Cypriots	D	IV.29; XII.2	
14	Tarsus	D	IV.30	
15	Mallus	D	IV.30	
16	Daphne	D	IV.33	
17	Antioch	D	IV.33; V.21; VIII.35; XIII.23, 26; XIV.27	
18	Cilicia	D	IV.36	
19	Scythians	D	IV.47	
20	Arabs	C	V.8; XII.10, 11	
21	Spartans	D	V.9	
22	Phrygia	D	V.22	
23	Mt Gerzim	D	V.23; VI.2	
24	Mysian	D	V.24	
25	Athenian	D	VI.1	
26	Babylon	D	VIII.20	
27	Galatians	D	VIII.20	

² Column headings are described at the end of this table.

28	Macedonians	D	VIII.20, 20	
29	Persepolis	D	IX.2	
30	Ecbatana	D	IX.3	
31	Athens	D	IX.15	
32	Cyprus	D	X.13	
33	Idumaeans	C	X.15, 16; XII.32	
34	Gazara	C	X.32	
35	Bethrusa	C	XI.5; XIII.19, 22	
36	Jamnia	C	XII.8, 9	
37	Caspin	C	XII.13	
38	Jericho	C	XII.15	
39	Charax	C	XII.17ff	
40	Carnaim	C	XII.21, 26	
41	Ephron	C	XII.27	
42	Scythopolis	C	XII.29, 30	
43	Thracian	D	XII.35	
44	Marisa	C	XII.35	
45	Adullam	C	XII.38	
46	Jaminities	C	XII.40	
47	Beroea	D	XIII.4	
48	Modin	C	XIII.14	
49	Ptolemais to Gera	D	XIII.24	
50	Ptolemais	C	XIII.25	
51	Tripolis	D	XIV.1	
52	Adasa	C	XIV.16	
53	Samaria	C	XV.1	
54	Syrian	D	XV.36	

The column Headings are reasonably self explanatory. For the most part, they provide a variation on the information provided in Table One above:

Entry No.	Keeps a running total of the number of entries;
People / Place	Ordered by first reference in Second Maccabees. Where both place and people are in the text first reference to each is included, e.g. 'Athenian' (Entry No. 26) and 'Athens' (Entry No. 32) are both in the Table;
Location	Classification of location of each place or people in relation to the Jews: either Close (C), Distant (D), or Special (S);
References	The references in the text where that group of people or place can be found. Correlates with Table One;
Comment	Any additional notes or information that could be beneficial.

Appendix Three

Second Maccabees: Character Identification and Description¹

No.	Ref.	Name	Name (Gk/Hbrw)	Ethnicity (Gk/Jew)	Positive/ Negative	Comments
1	II.19	Judas	Hbrw	Jew	P	Judas Maccabaeus.
2	II.20	Antiochus	Gk	Gk	N	Antiochus IV; instigator of the persecutions.
3	II.20	Eupator	Gk	Gk	N	Antiochus V; son of Antiochus IV.
4	II.23	Jason	Gk	Gk#	Desc	Original author.
5	III.1	Onias	Hbrw	Jew	P	Probably Onias III. Described as 'pious' and 'hater of wickedness'. Note also XV.12-16.
6	III.3	Seleucus	Gk	Gk	N	Seleucus IV, although portrayed positively here for the purposes of propaganda is later the king who sent Heliodorus to raid the Temple [III.7ff].
7	III.4	Simon	Gk or Hbrw	Jew	N	This is a well attested Greek name from at least the Sixth Century B.C. Cf. Fraser et al. Vols. I, II, III A & B. Also a Jewish name. Simon quarrels with Onias III [III.1], described as 'Godless' [III.11].
8	III.5	Apollonius	Gk	Gk#	N	Son of Thrasaeus, governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. Informs king of Temple's riches.
9	III.5	Thraseus	Gk	Gk#	Desc	Father of Apollonius.
10	III.7	Heliodorus	Gk	Gk#	N	Chief minister of king who attempts to confiscate the Temple's wealth for his king.
11	III.11	Hyrchanus	Possibly Gk or Iranian	Jew	N	Name is attested in Attica, cf. Fraser et al. Vol II (1994) 438 = <i>IG</i> II2 4700 + <i>SEG</i> (1965) XXI 799. Name could be connected to the territory of 'Υρκανία. It is not Hebrew, although

¹ This Table excludes any names in the two letters at the beginning of Second Maccabees. See the Introduction and Chapter Eight this thesis, also Goldstein (1983) 25. Column Headings are described at the end of this table.

						<p>all references in Pape et al. are associated with Judaea, albeit starting with this one.</p> <p>Hyrchanus was the son of Tobias, a man of high standing – but not liked. The abridger's audience would know Hyrcanus was a tax collector and had killed two of his brothers. This statement helps provide an insight into Jewish clan politics; see Goldstein (1983) 208.</p>
12	III.11	Tobias	Hbrw	Jew	Desc	Father of Hyrcanus. Supporter of Ptolemies: see Goldstein (1975) 85-123.
13	IV.4	Apollonius	Gk	Gk#	N	Son of Menestheus, governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. Encourages Simon in his evil ways. Probably not the same Apollonius as in III.5; see Goldstein (1983) 204.
14	IV.4	Menestheus	Gk	Gk#	Desc	Father of Apollonius.
15	IV.7	Jason	Gk	Jew	N	Brother of Onias [III.1], gains high priesthood through bribery. Note description at IV.13, attacks Jerusalem V.5ff. First Jew in II Macc. With a Greek name.
16	IV.11	John	Hbrw	Jew	P	Had established royal privileges for the Jews.
17	IV.11	Eupolemus	Gk	Jew	P	Son of John [IV.11]. Negotiated friendship with the Romans. A Greek name for a Hellenised Jew would have its advantages with such a diplomatic role.
18	IV.21	Philometor	Gk	Gk	Desc	Descriptive reference to King Ptolemy Philometor of Egypt (see also IX.29). No way to assess if references are positive or negative.
19	IV.23	Menelaus	Gk	Jew	N	Supported Jason [IV.7], then outbid him to gain high priesthood. Is killed at XIII.3ff.
20	IV.28	Sostratus	Gk	Gk#	N	Commander of Jerusalem's guard and the collector of revenue.
21	IV.29	Lysimachus	Gk	Jew	N	Menelaus' [IV.23] brother and supporter: evil, cf. IV.39.
22	IV.29	Crates	Gk	Gk#	N	Sostratus' [IV.27] second in command, commander of the Cypriot mercenaries.

23	IV.30	Antiochis	Gk	Gk#	N	King's Concubine: Tarus and Mallus (Two cities) given to her as a gift. Negative by direct association with king and indirect cause of Tarus and Mallus to rebel.
24	IV.31	Andronicus	Gk	Gk#	N	King's regent. Murdered Onias [III.1] through Menelaus' [IV.23] prompting.
25	IV.40	Auranus	Arabic (Possibly Hbrw)	Jew#	N	Difficult name; Pape et al. has Αὔρανα as a name found in Arab deserts, and suggests that Αὔρανηνός derives from Αὔρα and that this name could equate to Αὔθα which is, again, Arabian. Goldstein notes that <i>Auranus</i> is a name carried by the Hasmonaeen family, so even if it is not Hebrew it may have a Jewish association [(1983) 242]. Auranus is the leader of the force that attacked Jewish crowds on orders from Lysimachus [IV.29]. Described as an old fool.
26	IV.45	Ptolemaeus	Gk	Gk#	N	Son of Dorymenes. Accepted bribe from Menelaus [IV.23]. See also VIII.8. At X.11ff he acts sympathetically towards the Jews – although this leads to his downfall.
27	IV.45	Dorymenes	Gk	Gk#	Desc	Father of Ptolemaeus.
28	V.8	Aretas	Arabic	Arab	P	Name well attested in line of Nabataean Arabs, see Goldstein (1983) 255; Pape et al. also list it as Arabic. Arabic king recognises the inappropriateness of the actions of Jason [IV.7]. But note that at XII.10 Arabs (no reference to Aretas) attack Jews.
29	V.22	Philip	Gk	Phrygian (Gk#)	N	Commissioner to Jerusalem, appointed by Antiochus. Described as more barbarous than his king.
30	V.23	Andronicus	Gk	Gk#	N	Commissioner to Mt Gerizim, appointed by Antiochus.

31	V.24	Apollonius	Gk	Gk#	N	Commanded Mysian mercenaries sent to kill Jewish males and sell the women and children into slavery.
32	VI.18	Eleazar	Hbrw	Jew	P	Teacher of law, distinguished elder. Suffered torture and death rather than eat pork (Martyrdom).
33	VII.6	Moses	Hbrw	Jew	Desc	Biblical/Historical reference.
34	VIII.9	Nicanor	Gk	Gk#	N	Member of the highest order of the king's friends. Sent by Ptolemaeus to support Philip against Judas.
35	VIII.9	Patroculus	Gk	Gk#	Desc	Father of Nicanor.
36	VIII.9	Gorgias	Gk	Gk#	N	General that went with Nicanor. This is possibly the same Gorgias as at X.14 and XII.32-37 – see Goldstein (1983) 328 – I am not so sure, see comments below at X.14.
37	VIII.19	Sennacherib	?	Babylon	Desc	Biblical/Historical reference.
38	VIII.22	Simon	Gk or Hbrw	Jew	N	Judas' brother; see failure at X.19ff and XIV.17.
39	VIII.22	Josephus	Hbrw	Jew	P	Judas' brother, otherwise unknown. See Goldstein (1983) 334.
40	VIII.22	Jonathan	Hbrw	Jew	P	Judas' brother.
41	VIII.23	Eleazar	Hbrw	Jew	P	Reads aloud from the Holy book for Judas' men. Name was possibly 'Ezra' not Eleazer, see Goldstein (1983) 334-5.
42	VIII.30	Timotheus	Gk	Gk#	N	Commander of forces that oppose Judas. Same Timotheus as at XII.2, 10-31.
43	VIII.30	Bacchides	Gk	Gk#	N	Commander of forces that oppose Judas.
44	VIII.33	Callisthenes	Gk	Gk#	N	Described as impious.
45	IX.29	Philip	Gk	Gk#	N	Close friend of Antiochus IV.
46	X.11	Lysias	Gk	Gk	N	Supporter and kinsman (see XI.1) of king.
47	X.12	Ptolemaeus Macron	Gk	Gk#	P	Fails in support of the Jews, is a Greek outcast. Exception that proves the rule.
48	X.14	Gorgias	Gk	Gk#	N	Possibly the same Gorgias as at VIII.9, although it is difficult to understand how a failed military commander would become Governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. This is probably the same Gorgias as at XII.32-37, see Goldstein (1983) 389.

49	X.19	Josephus	Hbrw	Jew	P	Commander under Judas.
50	X.19	Zacchaeus	Hbrw	Jew	P	Commander under Judas.
51	X.24	Timotheus	Gk	Gk#	N	Timotheus the phylarch from the Ammonite territory as opposed to the Seleucid commander. See Goldstein (1976) 296ff; (1983) 339, 395, 399, 433. This Timotheus is killed at X.37. Despite Goldstein's assertions [(1976) 296ff] this is probably the same Timotheus as at XII.2 – the historical descriptions are not in chronological order.
52	X.32	Chaereas	Gk	Gk#	N	Garrison commander that sheltered Timotheus [X.24].
53	X.37	Apollophanes	Gk	Gk#	N	Supporter and brother of Timotheus [X.24].
54	XI.17	John	Hbrw	Jew	P	Jewish ambassador.
55	XI.17	Absalom	Hbrw	Jew	P	Jewish ambassador.
56	XI.34	Quintus Memmius	Roman	Roman	P	Roman who sent Jews a letter.
57	XI.34	Titus Manilius	Roman	Roman	P	Roman who sent Jews a letter. There are difficulties with this name: see Goldstein (1983) 422-425.
58	XII.2	Apollonius	Gk	Gk#	N	Son of Gennaeus, distinguishes him from Apollonius at V.24. See Goldstein (1983) 433. Governor of territory near Judaea who prevents the Jews from living in peace.
59	XII.2	Gennaeus	? [Gk]	Gk#	Desc	Father of Apollonius. Name means 'noble' and is attested in parts of Greece. See Goldstein (1983) 433.
60	XII.2	Hieronymus	Gk	Gk#	N	Governor of territory near Judaea who prevents the Jews from living in peace.
61	XII.2	Demophon	Gk	Gk#	N	Governor of territory near Judaea who prevents the Jews from living in peace.
62	XII.2	Nicanor	Gk	Gk#	N	Described as the Chief of the Cypriot forces to distinguish him from the other Nicanor [VIII.9].
63	XII.19	Dositheus	Gk	Jew	N	One of Judas' generals who captures Timotheus but then fails to hold him and lets him go.
64	XII.19	Sosipater	Gk	Jew	N	One of Judas' generals who captures Timotheus but then fails to hold him and lets him go.

65	XII.35	Dositheus	Gk	Jew	N	Grabbed hold of Gorgias but failed to hold him. Dositheus is one of the 'Tubian Jews' who are associated with Timotheus at XII.17.
66	XII.36	Esdrias	Hbrw	Jew	P	One of Judas' commanders.
67	XIII.21	Rhodocus	Iranian (?)	Jew#	N	Name could be Iranian, see Goldstein (1983) 466. Not in Pape et al.; or Fraser et al. Passes secret information of Jewish situation to the enemy.
68	XIII.23	Philip	Gk	Gk#	N	Left in charge in Antioch. Different Philip from that at IX.29 who goes to Ptolemy. Could be the same as that at V.22, but very uncertain.
69	XIII.24	Hegemonides	Gk	Gk#	N	Left as governor of territory from Ptolemais to Gerra by Antiochus V.
70	XIV.1	Demetrius	Gk	Gk	N	Son of Seleucus IV, orders Nicanor to destroy Judas.
71	XIV.3	Alcimus	Gk	Jew	N	Formerly a high priest, degrades Jews (Judas and the Hasidaeans) to Demetrius to get his old position back.
72	XIV.12	Nicanor	Gk	Gk#	N	Attacks Judas, threatens to destroy Temple. Difficult to ascertain if this is the same or different Nicanor from that at VIII.9. See Goldstein (1983) 486.
73	XIV.19	Posidonius	Gk	Jew#	N	On side of Nicanor and Demetrius, negotiated settlement with Judas on their behalf. Treaty falls a part in long run.
74	XIV.19	Theodotus	Gk	Jew#	N	On side of Nicanor and Demetrius, negotiated settlement with Judas on their behalf. Theodotus is a Greek name widely used by Jews, see Goldstein (1983) 489. Treaty falls apart in the long run.
75	XIV.19	Mattathias	Hbrw	Jew#	N	On side of Nicanor and Demetrius, negotiated settlement with Judas on their behalf. Treaty falls a part in long run.
76	XIV.37	Razis	Hbrw	Jew	P	Described as pious, commits suicide rather than submit to gross humiliation
77	XV.14	Jeremiah	Hbrw	Jew	Desc	Biblical/Historical reference.
78	XV.22	Hezekiah	Hbrw	Jew	Desc	Biblical/Historical reference.

Column Headings are self explanatory:

No.	Number: A running total of entries.
Ref.	Reference: The listed reference is to the first entry to that name, subsequent entries are not necessarily referred too. Therefore, for example, we only have one reference to Judas Maccabaeus (the first time he is mentioned), although he is cited extensively in the text.
Name	Name of person. Every name in Second Maccabees is included.
Name (Gk/ Hbrw)	Whether the name in the previous column is a Greek or Hebrew name. A question mark indicates uncertainty.
Ethnicity (Gk/Jew)	<p>If the ethnicity of the person can be determined it is listed. Probable ethnic origins are also listed and denoted by an # mark. Gk# can also indicate a person on the Seleucid side (governor or military commander etc.) – so that the association is to the Greeks – even if the exact ethnicity of the person cannot be determined, i.e. the person might not necessarily be Greek: consider, for example, the entry at X.24 [Timotheus the phylarch from the Ammonite territory].</p> <p>For the purposes of this study Macedonians and Seleucids are counted as Greek.</p>
Positive/Negative	<p>An attempt is made to define the person as good, pious, successful = positive (i.e. Judas Maccabaeus) or bad, evil, failure = negative (i.e. Antiochus IV). The assessment is made from the perspective of the author and based on all actions the person carries out in the book (evil acts out weigh good: that is, for example Nicanor at XIV .12 is judged ‘negative’ [see XIV.12-18; 28-30; 31-36; XV.1-37] even though at times he was ‘positive’ [XIV.20-27]).</p>
Comments	Any extra details, observations.

Abbreviations

AJPh	American Journal of Philology. The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
ANET	Pritchard J.B. [Ed.] <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating To The Old Testament</i> Third Edition with Supplement (Princeton, 1969).
<i>Antiquities</i>	Josephus <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i> [Jewish Antiquities].
Arethusa	Arethusa: A Journal of the Wellsprings of Western Man. State University of New York, Buffalo.
<i>Aristeas</i>	Letter of Aristeas.
ASNP	Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Cl. Di Lettere e Filosofia. S. n., Pisa.
<i>Ath. Pol.</i>	[Psuedo] Aristotle <i>The Athenian Constitution</i> .
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.
<i>B.J.</i>	Josephus <i>Bellum Judaicum</i> [Jewish War].
BMCR	Bryn Mawr Classical Review. Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
CIJ	Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum.
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
CPH	Classical Philology. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.
CPJ	Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum.
Ed.	Editor.
EJ	Encyclopedia Judaica. Vols. I-X. Berlin 1928-1934.
Eranos	Eranos: acta philologica Suecana. Eranos' Förlag, Uppsala.
FGrHist	Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, F. Jacoby [Ed.]. Weidman: Berlin; Brill, Leiden. (Berlin 1922-56, Leiden 1994-).
G & R	Greece and Rome. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
Hdt.	Herodotus' <i>Histories</i> .
Hermes	Hermes: Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie. Steiner, Wiesbaden.
HTR	Harvard Theological Review. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. & London.
IEF	Israel Exploration Journal. Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem.
JA	Journal Asiatique. Geuthner, Paris.
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society. American Oriental Society, Baltimore.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature. Society of Biblical Literature, Philadelphia.
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies.
JR	Journal of Religion. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
LXX	Septuagint.

I Macc.	First Maccabees.
II Macc.	Second Maccabees.
O.G.I.S.	Dittenberger W. [Ed.] <i>Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: Supplementum Sylloges Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York; 1903).
Panegyricus	Isocrates <i>Panegyricus</i> .
Phoenix	The Phoenix: The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
Ps.	Psalm.
RBL	Review of Biblical Literature.
Repr.	Reprint(ed).
Rev.	Revised.
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.
Stromateis	Clement of Alexandria ' <i>Stromateis</i> .
Tac. <i>Hist.</i>	Tacitus <i>Histories</i> .
TAPA	Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association. Decatur, Ga., Scholars Press.
Thuc.	Thucydides.
<i>Vita</i>	Josephus <i>The Life</i> .
Vol.	Volume.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aeschylus *Aeschylus*. Vol. Two: Agamemnon. With an English Translation by H.W. Smyth. Edited by H. Lloyd-Jones (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1963).

Appian *Appian's Roman History*. In Four Volumes. With an English Translation by H. White (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1912-13).

Apollodorus *Apollodorus The Library*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by J.G. Frazer (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts, 1921).

Apollodorus 'Epitome'. In *Apollodorus The Library*. Vol. II. With an English Translation by J.G. Frazer (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1921).

Aristotle *The Politics*. With an English translation by H.Rackman (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1932).

Aristotle *The Athenian Constitution, The Eudemian Ethics, On Virtues and Vices*. With an English translation by H.Rackman (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1952).

Arrian *Anabasis and Indica*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by P.A. Brunt (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1976, 1983).

Cassius Dio *Historia Romana*. With an English Translation by E.Cary (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1914-1927).

Cicero 'De Oratore'. In *Cicero: De Oratore*. In Two Volumes [Traditionally Vol. III and IV in "Cicero Works: [A] Rhetorical Treatises" In Five Volumes]. With an English Translation by E.W. Sutton. Completed with an Introduction by H. Rackman (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1948).

Cicero 'De Oratore'. In K.F. Kumaniecki [Ed.] *M.Tulli Ciceronis: De Oratore* (Teubner, 1969).

Clement of Alexandria 'Stromateis'. In A Roberts and J. Donaldson [Eds.] *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of The Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Vol. II. Revised by A.C. Coxe (WM.B. Eerdmans: Michigan, 1962).

Curtius *Quintus Curtius History of Alexander*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by J.C. Rolfe (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1946).

Diodorus *Diodorus of Sicily*. In Twelve Volumes. Vol. IX. With an English Translation by R.M. Geer (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1947).

Dittenberger W. [Ed.] *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: Supplementum Sylloges Inscriptionum Graecarum* (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York; 1903).

Edgar C.C. *Zenon Papyri*. Vol. I-V. Publications de la Societe Fouad I de papyrologie (Hildesheim, 1971).

Euripides 'Bacchae' In *Euripides*. Vol. III. With an English Translation by A.S. Way (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1962).

Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by K. Lake (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1926).

Eusebius 'Praeparatio Evangelica'. In G. Dindorfius [Ed.] *Eusebii Caesariensis Opera: Praeparationis Evangelicae*. In Two Volumes (Teubneri: Lipsiae, 1867).

Herodotus *Herodotus: Histories*. In Four Volumes. With an English Translation by A.D. Godley (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1920).

Hesiod 'Works and Days'. In *Hesiod: Homeric Hymns and Homeric Hymns*. With an English Translation by H.G. Evelyn-White (Loeb Classical Library: London, New York; 1920).

Hesiod 'Homeric Hymns'. In *Hesiod The Homeric Hymns and Homeric Hymns*. With an English Translation by H.G. Evelyn-White (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1959).

Homer *The Iliad of Homer*. Translated by R. Lattimore (Chicago, 1951).

Homer *Homer: Iliad*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by A.T. Murray. Revised by W.F. Wyatt Second Edition (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1999).

Horace 'Odes'. In *The Odes and Epodes*. With an English Translation by C.E. Bennett (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1952).

Isocrates *Isocrates*. In Three Volumes. With an English Translation by G. Norlin (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1928, repr. 1954).

Isocrates *Isocrates I*. Translated by D.C. Mirhady and Yin Lee Too (Austin, 2000).

Isocrates 'Panegyricus'. In *Isocrates*. Vol. I. With an English Translation by G. Norlin (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1928, repr. 1954).

Isocrates 'Evagoras'. In *Isocrates*. Vol. III. With an English Translation by G. Norlin (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1928, repr. 1954).

Jacoby F. [Ed.] *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Berlin and Leiden, 1922-56; Leiden 1994-).

Jerome 'Prologus Galeatus'. In *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*. Translated by W.H. Fremantle, G. Lewis, W.G. Mortley. A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Second Series. Vol VI (T & T Clark: Edinburgh; 1996).

Josephus *Josephus Bellum Judaicum* [The Jewish War]. Vols II-III. With an English Translation by H. St. Thackeray (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1926-1965).

Josephus *Josephus Against Apion*. Vol. I. With an English Translation by H. St. Thackeray (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1926-1965).

Josephus *Jewish Antiquities*. In Nine Volumes with an English Translation by R. Marcus, H. St. J. Thackeray, A. Wikren, L.H. Feldman (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1926-1965).

Josephus *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. New Updated Edition. Translated By W. Whiston (Hendrickson: Peabody, MA; 1987).

Kittel G [Ed.] *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* Vol. IV A-N. Translated (and Edited) from the German "Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament" by G.W. Bromiley (Michigan, 1967).

Lenger M-T. [Ed.] *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptoleemes*. Academie Royale de Belgique, Memoires LXI.3 (Brussels, 1964).

Livy *Livy In Fourteen Volumes*. With an English Translation by B.O. Foster, F.G. Moore, E.T. Sage, A.C. Schlesinger (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1919-1951).

First Maccabees In *Septuaginta*. Ed. by A. Rahlfs (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart; 1979). English translations used: Goldstein J.A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 41 (New York, 1976); *The Revised English Bible with Apocrypha* (Oxford, Cambridge; 1989).

Second Maccabees In *Septuaginta*. Ed. by A. Rahlfs (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart; 1979). English translations used: Goldstein J.A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 41A (New York, 1983); *The Revised English Bible with Apocrypha* (Oxford, Cambridge; 1989).

Ovid 'Heroides'. In *Ovid Heriodes and Amores*. Volume One. With an English Translation by G. Showerman, Revised by G.P. Gould. Second Edition (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1977).

Origen 'Contra Celsum'. In *The Writings of Origen*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by F. Crombie (Edinburgh, 1910-11).

Pausanias *Pausanias' Description of Greece*. In Four Volumes. With an English Translation by W.H.S. Jones (Loeb Classical Library: London, New York; 1918-1935).

Philo 'In Flaccum' [Against Flaccus]. In *Philo* Vol. IX. With an English Translation by F.H. Colson (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1941-).

Philo 'De Legatione ad Gaium' [On the Embassy to Gaius]. In *Philo* Vol. X. With an English Translation by F.H. Colson (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1941-).

Pindar 'Olympian I'. In *The Odes of Pindar*. With an English Translation by J. Sandys (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1946).

Pindar 'Pythian Odes'. In *The Odes of Pindar*. With an English Translation by J. Sandys (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1946).

Plato 'Menexenos'. In *Platonis Opera*. Vol. III. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis

Plato 'Menexenos'. In *Plato*. Vol. VII. With an English Translation by R.G. Bury (Loeb Classical Library: London, New York; 1929).

Plato 'Republic'. In *Plato*. In Twelve Volumes. Vol. V and VI. With an English Translation by P. Shorey (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1987).

Plautus 'Pseudolos'. In *Plautus*. Vol. IV. With an English Translation by P. Nixon (Loeb Classical Library: London, New York; 1932).

Plutarch 'Agesilaus'. In *Plutarch's Lives*. Vol. V. With an English Translation by B. Perrin (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1955).

Plutarch 'Alexander'. In *Plutarch's Lives*. Vol. VII. With an English Translation by B. Perrin (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; repr. 1999).

Plutarch 'Antony'. In *Plutarch's Lives*. Vol. IX. With an English Translation by B. Perrin (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1950).

Plutarch 'De Iside et Osiride' [Isis and Osiris]. In *Plutarch Moralia*. Vol. V. With an English Translation by F.C. Babbitt (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1936).

Plutarch 'Quaestiones Conviviales'. In *Plutarch Moralia*. Vol. VIII and IX. With an English Translation by E.L. Minar, P.H. Sandbach, W.C. Helmbold (Vol. VIII) and P.A. Clement, H.B. Hoffleit (Vol. IX) (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1961, 1969).

Polybius *The Histories*. In Six Volumes. With an English Translation by W.R. Paton (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1922-27).

Septuagint *Septuaginta*. Ed. by A. Rahlfs (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart; 1979).

Sophocles 'Philoctetes'. In *Sophocles: Antigone, The Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus*. Edited and Translated by H. Lloyd-Jones (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1994).

Sophocles 'Oedipus Tyrannus'. In *Sophocles: Ajax, Electra, Oedipus Tyrannus*. Edited and Translated by H. Lloyd-Jones (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1994).

Strabo *The Geography of Strabo*. In Eight Volumes. With an English translation by H.L. Jones (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts; 1949).

Tacitus *The Histories*. In Two Volumes. Translated with Introduction and Notes by W.H.Fyfe (Oxford, 1912).

Thucydides *Thucydides*. In Four Volumes. With an English Translation by C.F. Smith (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts, 1919-23).

Xenophon *Hellenica*. In Two Volumes. With an English Translation by C.L. Brownson (Loeb Classical Library: London, Massachusetts, 1968).

Secondary Sources

Abel F.M. 'Topographie des campagnes machabéennes'. In *Revue Biblique* 32 (1923) 495-521.

Abel F.M. *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Études Bibliques. (Paris: Gabalda, 1949).

Ackroyd P.R. *Exile And Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (SCM Press: London, 1968).

Ackroyd P.R. 'The Old Testament in the Making'. In P.R. Ackroyd & C.F. Evans [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of the Bible Vol. One: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1970) 67-113.

Ackroyd P.R. & Evans C.F. [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of the Bible Vol. One: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1970).

Afzal-Khan F. & Seshadri-Croots K. *The Pre Occupation With Post Colonial Studies* (Duke University Press: Durham, London; 2000).

Alon G. 'On The History Of The High Priesthood At The End Of The Second Temple Period'. In *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World* Translated from the Hebrew by Abrahams I. (Jerusalem, 1977) 48-77.

Anderson G.W. 'Canonical And Non-Canonical'. In P.R. Ackroyd & C.F. Evans [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of the Bible Vol. One: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1970) 113-159.

Applebaum S. 'Hellenistic Cities Of Judaea And Its Vicinity – Some New Aspects'. In B. Levick [Ed.] *The Ancient Historian And His Materials* (Gregg International: Farnborough, 1975) 59-73.

Applebaum S. 'Jewish Urban Communities and Greek Influences'. In *Scripta Classica Israelica* Vol. 5 (1979/80) 158-77.

Applebaum S. *Judaea in Hellenistic and Roman Times: Historical and Archaeological Essays* (Brill: Leiden, New York, København, Köln; 1989).

Ashcroft B. *PostColonial Transformation* (Routledge: London and New York; 2001).

Austin M.M. [Ed.] *The Hellenistic World From Alexander to the Roman Conquests: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981).

Badian E. 'Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind'. In *Historia* VII (1958) 425-44.

Banks M. *Ethnicity: Anthropological Constructions* (Routledge: London and New York; 1996).

Barclay J. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1996).

Bar-Kochva B. *The Seleucid Army: Organisation and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1976).

Bar-Kochva B. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1989).

Barth F. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Boston, 1969).

Bartlet J.R. *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristaeas, The Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC To AD 200: Vol. I Part I (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1985).

Bartlet J.R. [Ed.] *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (Routledge: London and New York; 2002).

Bauman G. 'Collective Identity as a Dual Discursive Construction: Dominant v. Demotic Discourses of Culture and the Negotiation of Historical Memory'. In H. Friese [Ed.] *Identities: Time, Difference and Boundaries* (Berghahn Books: New York, Oxford; 2002) 189-200.

Bentley G.C. 'Ethnicity and Practice'. In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 29 (1987) 24-55.

Bernard P. 'Les traditions orientales dans l'architecture Gréco-Bactrienne'. In *JA* 264 (1976) 245-75.

Betz O. 'The Essenes'. In W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, J. Sturdy [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of Judaism Vol. Three: The Early Roman Period* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999) III.444-470.

Biale D. [Ed.] *Cultures Of The Jews: A New History* (Shoken Books: New York, 2002).

Bickerman E.J. *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (Berlin, 1937). Translated into English by H.R. Moehring *The God of The Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabaeen Cult*. In *Studies in Judaism In Late Antiquity Vol. XXXII* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1979).

Bickerman E.J. *From Erza to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism* (Shoken Books: New York, 1962).

Bickerman E.J. *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. In Three Volumes (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1976-).

Bickerman E.J. 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr.' In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History II* (Brill: Leiden, 1980) 136-58

Bickerman E.J. 'The Babylonian Captivity'. In W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of Judaism: Vol. One Introduction, The Persian Period* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1984) 342-358.

Bickerman E.J. *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London; 1988).

Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J. [Eds.] *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*. *Studies in Hellenistic Civilization Vol. I* (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus, 1990).

Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J. [Eds.] *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*. *Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. III* (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus, 1992).

Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J. [Eds.] *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship* *Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. VII* (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus, 1996).

Bosworth A.B. *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History Of Alexander*. Volume Two: Comentary on Books IV-V (Oxford, 1995).

Bravo B. *Philologie, histoire, philosophie, de l'histoire: Étude sur J.G. Droysen, historien de l'antiquité* (Wroclaw, Warsaw, and Krakow; 1968).

Briant P. *Alexandre le Grand*. Third Rev. Ed. (Paris, 1987).

Briant P. 'The Seleucid Kingdom, The Achaemenid Empire and the History of the Near East in the First Millenium B.C.'. In P. Bilde et al. (Eds.) *Religion and Religious Practices in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus, 1990) 40-65.

Bright J. *A History of Israel*. Third Edition (Westminster Press: Philadelphia, 1981).

Bringmann K. *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa* (Göttingen, 1983).

Brunt P.A. 'The Aims of Alexander'. In *G&R Second Series* Vol. 12 No. 2 (1965) 203-215.

Burckhardt J. *The Greeks And Greek Civilisation*. Translated by S. Stern. Edited with Introduction by O. Murray (St Martins Press: New York, 1998).

Burkert W. *Greek Religion*. Translated from the German by John Raffan (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1985).

Bury J.B. and Meiggs R. *A History of Greece: To The Death Of Alexander The Great*. Fourth Ed. (MacMillan Press: London, Basingstoke; 1975).

Buttrick G.A. [Ed.] *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*. In Four Vols. (Abingdon: Nashville, 1962).

Buxton R. [Ed.] *From Myth to Reason: Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (Oxford, 1999).

Cartledge P. 'Herodotus and "The Other": A Mediation on Empire'. In *Echos du Monde Classique / Classical Views* XXXIV, N.S. 9 (1990) 27 – 40.

Cartledge P. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford, 1993).

Cassuto U. *A Commentary on the Book Of Exodus*. Translated from the Hebrew by I. Abrahams (Jerusalem, 1967).

Charlesworth J.H. [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (DoubleDay: Garden City, New York; 1985).

Childs B.S. *Exodus: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library (London, 1974).

Chilver G.E.F. *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus' "Histories" IV and V*. Completed and Revised by Townsend G.B. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1985).

Coggins R.J. *The Books of Ezra And Nehemiah*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne; 1976).

Cody A. *A History of the Old Testament Priesthood* (Pontifical Biblical Institute: Rome, 1969).

Cohen G.D. 'The Story of Hannah and Her Seven Sons in Hebrew Literature'. In *M. Kaplin Jubilee Volume*. Hebrew Section (Jewish Theological Seminary of America: New York, 1953) 109-122.

Cohen N.G. 'Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity'. In *Journal for the Study of Judaism* Vol. 7 (1976) 97-128.

Cohen R. 'Ethnicity: Problem and Focus in Anthropology'. In *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 7 (1978) 379-403.

Cohen S.D. 'Respect for Judaism by Gentiles in the Writings of Josephus'. In *HTR* 80 (1987) 409-430.

Cohen S.J.D. 'Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew'. In *HTR* Vol. 82 (1989) 13-33.

Cohen S.D. 'Religion, Ethnicity and "Hellenism" in the Emergence of Jewish Identity in Maccabean Palastine'. In P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle (Eds.) *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization Vol. I (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus; 1990) 204-223.

Cohen S.J.D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 31 (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1999).

Colledge M. 'Greek and Non-Greek Interaction in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East'. In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White [Eds.] *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilisations From Syria to Central Asia After Alexander* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 1987) 134-162.

Collins A.Y. 'Aristobulus (Second Century B.C.) A New Translation and Introduction'. In J.H. Charlesworth [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (DoubleDay: Garden City, New York; 1985).

Collins J.J. 'Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Environment'. In *BASOR* 220 (1975) 27-36.

Collins J.J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Crossroad: New York, 1983).

Coogan M.D. 'Life in the Diaspora'. In *The Biblical Archaeologist* 37 (1974) 6-12.

Crawford M. and Whitehead D. [Eds.] *Archaic and Classical Greece: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, London, New York; 1983).

Crowther N.B. 'Athletic Dress and Nudity in Greek Athletics'. In *Eranos* 80 (1982) 163-168.

Cutter C. and Oppenheim M.F. *Judaica Reference Sources: A Selective Annotated Bibliographic Guide* Second Edition (The Denali Press, 1993).

Davies W.D. *The Territorial Dimension of Judaism* (Berkeley, 1982).

Dewald C. 'Women and Culture in Herodotus' *Histories*' In Foley H. [Ed.] *Reflections of Women in Antiquity* (New York, 1981).

Dodds E.R. *Euripides Bacchae: Edited with Introduction and Commentary by E.R. Dodds* (Oxford, 1944).

Doran R. '2 Maccabees and "Tragic History" '. In *Hebrew Union College Annual* Vol. 50 (1979) 107-114.

Doran R. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of Second Maccabees* (The Catholic Biblical Association of America: Washington, 1981).

Droysen J.G. *Geschichte der Diadochen* (Gotha, 1836).

Droysen J.G. *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (Gotha, 1877).

Duszak A. [Ed.] *Us and Others: Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures* (John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Philadelphia; 2002).

Eddy S.K. *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near-Eastern Resistance to Hellenism* (University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln, 1961).

Edson C. 'Imperium Macedonicum: The Seleucid Empire and the Literary Evidence'. In *Classical Philology* 53 (1958) 153-70.

Efron J. *Studies on the Hasmonean Period* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, New York, København, Köln; 1987). Originally published in Hebrew as J. Efron *Hikrei ha-Tekufa ha-Hashmona'it* (Tel Aviv, 1980).

Eissfeldt O. *The Old Testament: An Introduction Including the Apocrypha and Psuedepigrpha, and also the works of similar type from Qumran. The History of the Formation of the Old Testament.* Translated by P.R. Ackroyd (Oxford, 1966).

Elcock W.D. *The Romance Languages* (London, 1960).

Enloe C.H. *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development* (Boston, 1973).

Feldman L.H. 'Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* in Retrospect'. In *JBL* 96 (1977) 371-82.

Feldman L.H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions From Alexander to Justinian.* (Princeton, 1993).

Feldman L.H. *Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* (Leiden, New York, Köln; 1996).

Feldman L.H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1998).

Finley M.I. *The Uses and Abuses of History* (Chatto & Windus: London, 1975).

Fishman J.A. 'Language and Identity in Bilingual Education'. In W.C. McReady [Ed.] *Culture, Ethnicity and Identity: Current Issues in Research* (New York, London, Paris; 1983) 127-137.

Flory S. *The Archaic Smile of Herodotus* (Detroit, 1987).

Fraser P.M. 'Review of Hadas. *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion*'. In *CR* 11 (1961) 145-8.

Fraser P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. In Three Vols. (Oxford, 1972).

Fraser P.M. and Mathews E. [Eds.] *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* Vol. I-III (Oxford, 1987-2000).

Frend W.H.C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Christian Church* (DoubleDay, New York, 1967).

Freyne S. 'Introduction: Studying the Jewish Diaspora'. In J.R. Bartlett [Ed.] *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (Routledge: London and New York; 2002) 1-5.

Friedman J. 'Notes on Culture and Identity in Imperial Worlds'. In P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle (Eds.) *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*. *Studies in Hellenistic Civilization* Vol. I (Aarhus, 1990) 14-39.

Friese H. [Ed.] *Identities: Time, Difference and Boundaries* (Berghahn Books: New York, Oxford; 2002).

Gafni I. *Land, Centre and Diaspora: Jewish Perceptions of National Dispersion and Land Centrality in Late Antiquity* (Sheffield, 1997).

Garbini G. *History and Ideology In Ancient Israel*. Translated by J. Bowden from the Italian "Storia e Ideologia nell'Israele Antico", 1986 (London, 1988).

Gilbert P. *Peoples, Cultures and Nations in Political Philosophy* (Washington, 2000).

Golden M. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1998).

Goldstein J.A. 'The Tales of the Tobiads'. In J. Neusner *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Vol. III (Leiden, 1975) 85-123.

Goldstein J.A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 41 (Doubleday: New York, 1976).

Goldstein J.A. 'Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism'. In E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten, and A. Mendelson [Eds.] *Jewish and Christian Self Definition*. Vol. Two: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman World (London, 1981) II 64-87, 318-326.

Goldstein J.A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 41A (Doubleday: New York, 1983).

Goldstein J.A. 'The Message of "Aristeas to Philocrates": In the Second Century B.C.E., Obey the Torah, Venerate the Temple of Jerusalem, But Speak Greek, And Put Your Hopes in the Ptolemaic Dynasty'. In Menachem M. [Ed.] *Eretz Israel, Israel and the Jewish Diaspora Mutual Relations*. Proceedings of the First Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilisation held on Sunday-Monday October 9-10, 1988 (Lanham, New York, London; 1991) 1-23.

Gomme A.W. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. In Five Volumes: Vol. 4 and 5 by A.W. Gomme, A. Andrews, and K.J. Dover (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1945-1981).

Goodman M. 'Jews and Judaism in the Mediterranean Diaspora in the Late Roman Period: The Limitations of Evidence'. In *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*. Vol. IV No. 2 (1994) 208-224.

Gould J. *Myth, Ritual, Memory and Exchange: Essays in Greek Literature and Culture* (Oxford, 2001).

Grabbe L.L. *Judaism From Cyrus to Hadrian* Vol. One: 'The Persian and Greek Period'. Vol. Two: 'The Roman Period' (Minneapolis, 1992).

Grabbe L.L. 'Hellenistic Judaism'. In Neusner J. *Judaism In Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 1995) 55-83.

Grabbe L.L. 'The Hellenistic City of Jerusalem'. In Bartlett J.R. [Ed.] *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (Routledge: London and New York; 2002) 6-21.

Grainger J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer* (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1997)

Gray V.J. 'Herodotus and the Rhetoric of "Otherness" '. In *AJPh* 116 (1985) 185-211.

Green P. *Classical Bearings: Interpreting Ancient History And Culture* (Thames & Hudson, 1989).

Green P. *Alexander to Actium: The Hellenistic Age* (Thames & Hudson: London, 1990).

Green P. [Ed.] *Hellenistic History and Culture* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford; 1993).

Greenspoon L.J. 'Between Alexander and Antioch: Jews and Judaism in the Hellenistic Period'. In M.D. Coogan [Ed.] *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1998) 421-465.

Griffiths D. *A Critical Bibliography of Writings on Judaism* Part I. Jewish Studies Volume Two (The Edwin Mellen Press: Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter; 1988).

Grimm C.L.W. *Zweites Buch der Maccabäer*. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes (Leipzig, 1857).

Gruen E.S. 'Hellenism and Persecution: Antiochus IV and the Jews'. In P. Green (Ed.) *Hellenistic History and Culture* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford; 1993) 238 – 264.

Gruen E.S. 'Hellenistic Kingship: Puzzles, Problems and Possibilities'. In Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J. [Eds.] *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship* Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. VII (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus; 1996) 116-125.

Gruen E.S. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 1998).

Gruen E.S. *Diaspora: Jews Among Greeks and Romans* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, London; 2002).

Gruen E.S. 'Hellenistic Judaism'. In Biale D. [Ed.] *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (Shoken Books: New York, 2002a) 77-132.

Guibernau M. and Rex J. [Eds.] *The Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration* (Polity Press: Cambridge, Oxford, Malden; 1997).

Habicht C. 'Royal Documents in Maccabees II'. In *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80 (1976) 1-18.

Hadas M. *Aristeas To Philocrates* (New York, London; 1951).

Hadas M. *The Third and Fourth Book of Maccabees*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature (New York, 1953).

Hadas M. *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion* (Columbia: New York, London; 1959).

Haenchen E. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1971).

Hall E. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989).

Hall E. 'When is a Myth Not a Myth? Bernal's "Ancient Model" '. In *Arethusa* 25 (1992) 181-201.

Hall J.M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997).

Hall J.M. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago and London; 2002).

Hamilton J.R. *Alexander the Great* (London, 1973).

Hanfmann G. [Ed.] *Sardis From Prehistoric to Roman Times: Results from the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958-1975* (Cambridge MA, Harvard; 1983).

Hansen E.V. *The Attalids of Pergamon*. Second Ed. Series: Cornell Studies In Classical Philology Vol. 36 (Cornell: Ithaca and London; 1971).

Harrington D.J. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* (Michael Glazier: Wilmington, 1988).

Harris E. *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*. Foreword by F.C. Grant (New York, 1957).

Harris H.A. *Greek Athletics and the Jews*. Eds. I.M. Barton and A.J. Brothers (University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 1976).

Harrison T. *Divinity And History: The Religion Of Herodotus* (Oxford, 2000).

Harrison T. [Ed.] *Greeks And Barabarians* (Edinburgh, 2002).

Hartog F. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Translated by J. Lloyd (Berkeley, London, Los Angeles; 1988).

Hayward C.T.R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Source Book* (Routledge: London and New York, 1996).

Hendel R.S. 'Israel Among The Nations: Biblical Culture in the Ancient Near East'. In Biale D. [Ed.] *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (Shoken Books: New York, 2002) 43-75.

Hengel M. *Judaism and Hellenism; Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Vol I-II. Translated from the German by J. Bowden (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1974).

Hengel M. *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians : Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period*. Translated by J. Bowden (SCM Press: London; 1980).

Hengel M. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden (London, 1983).

Henten J. W. van and Avemarie F. *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity* (Routledge: London, New York; 2002).

Hoffman L. [Ed.] *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives* (Notre Dame, 1986).

Holladay C.R. 'Jewish Responses to Hellenistic Culture'. In Per Bilde [Eds.] *Ethnicity In Hellenistic Egypt*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. III (Aarhus, 1992) 139-163.

How W.W. and Wells J. A. *Commentary on Herodotus With Introduction and Appendixes* In Two Vols. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1912; reprinted with corrections 1928).

Hutchinson J. and Smith M. [Eds.] *Ethnicity* (Oxford, 1996).

Hyl Dahl N. 'The Maccabean Rebellion and the Question of "Hellenisation" '. In P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle (Eds.) *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization Vol. I (Aarhus, 1990) 188-203.

Ilan T. 'The Greek Names of the Hasmoneans'. In *Jewish Quarterly Review* 78 (1987) 1-20.

Jacobs A.S. 'Review: Erich Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews Amidst the Greeks and Romans*'. In *Review of Biblical Literature*. Society of Biblical Literature (06/2004).

Jellicoe S. *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1968).

Jellicoe S. [Ed.] *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, Interpretations* (New York, 1974).

Johnson S.R. *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 2004).

Jones A.H.M. *The Greek City: From Alexander to Justinian* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1940).

Jones A.H.M. 'A Taste for Things Greek: Hellenism in Syria and Palestine'. In A.J. Toynbee [Ed.] *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith* (Thames and Hudson: London, 1969) 99-123.

Jones A.H.M. *Cities of the Near Eastern Roman Provinces*. Second Edition (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1971).

Jones S. 'Identities In Practice: Towards an Archaeological Perspective on Jewish Identity in Antiquity'. In Jones S. and Pearce S. [Eds.] *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Journal For the Study of the Psuedepigrapha Supplement Series Vol. 31 (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1998) 29-49.

Jones S. and Pearce S. [Eds.] *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Journal For the Study of the Psuedepigrapha Supplement Series Vol. 31 (Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield, 1998).

Jonnes L. and Rici M. 'A New Royal Inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyriaion the Status of a *Polis*'. In *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29 (1997) 1-29.

Jowett B. *The Dialogues of Plato*. Translated into English with Analysis and Introduction. In Four Volumes (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1871).

Kaiser O. *Introduction To the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*. Translated by J. Sturdy (Augsburg Publishing House: Minneapolis, 1975).

Kasher A. 'Political and National Connections Between the Jews of Ptolemaic Egypt and Their Brethren in Eretz Israel'. In Menachem M. [Ed.] *Eretz Israel, Israel and the Jewish Diaspora Mutual Relations*. Proceedings of the First Annual Symposium of the Philip M. and Ethel Klutznick Chair in Jewish Civilisation held on Sunday-Monday October 9-10, 1988 (Lanham, New York, London; 1991) 24-41.

Kasher A. 'Changes in Manpower and Ethnic Composition of the Hasmonean Army'. In *Jewish Quarterly Review* 81 (1991a) 325-352.

Kerényi C.K. *Dionysos: Archetypal Image of Indestructable Life*. Translated by R. Manheim (London, 1976).

Kirk G.S. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Volume I: Books 1-4 (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1985).

Kittel G. [Ed.] *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* Vol. IV L-N. Translated (and Edited) from the German "Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament" by G.W. Bromiley (Michigan, 1967).

Kraabel A.T. 'The Roman Diaspora: Six Questionable Assumptions'. In *JJS* 33.1-2 (1982) 445-64.

Kraemer R.S. 'On the Meaning of "Jew" In Greco-Roman Inscriptions'. In *HTR* 82 (1989) 35-53.

Kuhrt A. 'Usurption, Conquest, and Ceremonial: From Babylon to Persia'. In D. Cannadine and S. Price [Eds.] *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*. Past and Present (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1987) 20-55.

Kuhrt A. 'The Selucid Kings and Babylonia: New Perspectives on the Selucid Realm in the East'. In Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J. [Eds.] *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. VII (Aarhus University Press: Aarhus, 1996) 41-54.

Kuhrt A. and Sherwin-White S. [Eds.] *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilisations From Syria to Central Asia After Alexander* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 1987).

LaCocque A. *Daniel in His Time* (South Carolina, 1988).

- Lateiner D.** *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (Toronto, 1989).
- Lattimore O.** *Inner Asian Frontiers of China* Second Edition (New York, 1951).
- Leinieks V.** *The City of Dionysos: A Study of Euripides' Bakchai* (Teubner: Stuttgart, 1996).
- Leith M.J.W.** 'Israel Among the Nations: The Persian Period'. In M.D. Coogan [Ed.] *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (New York, 1998) 367-419.
- Levine L.I.** *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Hendrickson: Seattle and London; 1998).
- Levi-Strauss C.** *The Scope of Anthropology*. Translated by S.O. Paul and R.A. Paul (London, 1967).
- Lieberman S.** *Greek In Jewish Palastine* (New York, 1942).
- Lieberman S.** *Hellenism In Jewish Palastine*. Second Ed. (New York, 1962).
- Lloyd A.B.** *Herodotus Book II Commentary 1-98* (Leiden, 1976).
- Lloyd G.E.R.** *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought* (Cambridge, 1966).
- Long T.** *Barbarians in Greek Comedy* (Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale and Edwardsville; 1986).
- Loomba A.** *Colonialism/PostColonialism* (Routledge: London and New York; 1998).
- Lord A.B.** *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, 1960).
- Lord A.B.** *The Singer Resumes His Tales* M.L. Lord [Ed.] (Cornell, 1995).
- McNight S.** *A Light Among The Gentiles* (Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1991).
- McReady W.C.** [Ed.] *Culture, Ethnicity and Identity: Current Issues in Research* (New York, London, Paris; 1983).
- Ma J.** *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford, 2002).
- Marincola J.** *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997).

Marincola J. *Greek Historians*. Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics No. 31 (Oxford, 2001).

Meeks W.A. 'Am I A Jew? – Johannine Christianity And Judaism'. In J. Neusner *Christianity, Judaism And Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies For Morton Smith At Sixty*. Vol. I (Leiden, 1975) 163-186.

Mendals D. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land* (Tübingen, 1987).

Mendels D. 'Creative History in the Hellenistic Near East in the Third and Second Centuries BCE: The Jewish Case'. In *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* No. 2 (1988) 13-20.

Merkelbach R. and West M.L. [Eds.] *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford, 1967).

Metzger B.M. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1957).

Meyers E.M. 'Jewish Culture in Greco-Roman Palestine'. In Biale D. [Ed.] *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (Shoken Books: New York, 2002) 135-179.

Millar F. 'The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's "Judaism and Hellenism"'. In *JJS* XXIX No. 1 (1978) 1-21.

Millar F. 'The Problem of Hellenistic Syria'. In Kuhrt A. and Sherwin-White S. [Eds.] *Hellenism in the East* (University of California: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 1987) 110-133.

Millar F. 'Hellenistic History in a Near Eastern Perspective: The Book of Daniel'. In P. Cartledge et al. [Eds.] *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (Berekely, Los Angeles, London; 1997) 89-104.

Mitford T.B. 'Ptolemy Macron'. In *Studi in onore de Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni* (Milano: Ceschina, 1957) 163-87.

Mölleken W. 'Geschichtsklitterung im I. Makkabäerbuch (Wan wurd's Alkimus Hoherpriester?)'. In *ZAW* 65 (1953) 205-28.

Momigliano A. Review of *Judentum und Hellenismus*, by M. Hengel'. In *JTS* 21 (1970) 149-53.

Momigliano A. 'Hellenism'. In *EJ* VIII (1972) col. 291 and in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Middletown, 1977) 307-312

Momigliano A. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne; 1975).

Momigliano A. 'The Second Book of Maccabees'. In *CPh* LXX No 2 (1975a) 81-88.

Momigliano A. *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Wesleyan University Press: Connecticut, 1977).

Momigliano A. 'Greek Historiography'. In *History and Theory* 17 (1978) 1-28.

Momigliano A. *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism*. Edited with an Introduction by S. Berti. Translated by M. Masella-Gayley (University of Chicago: Chicago and London; 1994).

Moore C.A. *Daniel, Esther, And Jeremiah: The Additions* (Double Day: New York, 1977).

Moore C.A. *Tobit: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible (DoubleDay: New York, 1996).

Moore D.S., Kosek J., Pandian A. [Eds.] *Race, Nature, And The Politics of Difference* (Duke: Durham and London; 2003).

Mørkholm O. *Antiochus IV of Syria* (København, 1966).

Morley N. *Writing Ancient History* (Cornell, 1999).

Munck J. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible Series Vol. 31 (New York, 1967).

Musti D. 'Syria and the East'. In F.W. Walbank et al. [Eds.] *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Hellenistic World*. Vol. VII Part 1 Second Ed. (Cambridge, London, New York; 1984) 175-220.

Neusner J. and Green W.S. [Eds.] *Dictionary of Judaism in The Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E. In Two Volumes* (MacMillian Library Reference USA: New York, 1996).

Niese B. 'Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung'. In *Hermes* 35 (1900) 268-307, 453-527 (=Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher. Berlin: Weidman, 1900).

Østergård U. 'What is National and Ethnic Identity'. In Per Bilde [Eds.] *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. III (Aarhus, 1992) 16-38.

Otzen B. 'Crisis and Religious Reaction: Jewish Apocalypticism'. In P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle (Eds.) *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization Vol. I (Aarhus, 1990) 224-236.

Overman J. 'The Diaspora in the Modern Study of Ancient Judaism'. In Overman J. and MacLennan R. [Eds.] *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel* (Atlanta, 1992) 63-78.

Pape W. and Bensler G.E. [Eds.] *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* In Two Vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1959).

Pardes I. 'Imagining the Birth of Ancient Israel: National Metaphors in The Bible'. In Biale D. [Ed.] *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (Shoken Books: New York, 2002) 9-41.

Parente F. and Sievers J. [Eds.] *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1994).

Parry A. [Ed.] *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford, 1971).

Pearce S. and Jones S. 'Introduction: Jewish Local Identities and Patriotism in the Graeco-Roman Period'. In S. Jones and S. Pearce [Eds.] *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Sheffield, 1998) 13-28.

Peremans W. 'Les revolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides'. In H. Maehler and V.M. Strocka [Eds.] *Das ptolemäische Ägypten: Akten des Internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz: Zabern, 1978) 39-50.

Pfeiffer R.H. *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Adam and Charles Black: London, 1948).

Pfeiffer R.H. *The History of New Testament Times* (New York, 1949).

Poorthuis M. and Safrai C. [Eds.] *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (Kampen, 1996).

Porton G.G. *Goyim: Gentiles and Israelites in Mishnah-Tosefta*. Brown Judaic Studies No. 155 (Scholars Press: Atlanta, 1988).

Price S. 'The Limits of Hellenisation'. In *The Oxford History of the Classical World* (Oxford, 1994) 315-337.

Pritchard J.B. [Ed.] *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Third Edition with Supplement (Princeton, 1969).

Rajak T. 'The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism'. In P.R. Davies and R.T. White [Eds.] *A Tribute to Geza Vermes* (England, 1990) 261-80.

Rajak T. 'The Location of Cultures in Second Temple Palastine: The Evidence of Josephus'. In Bauckham R. [Ed.] *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids. Carslie; 1995) 1-14.

Rajak T. 'Hasmonean Kingship and the Invention of Tradition'. In Bilde P., Engberg-Pedersen T., Hannestad L., Zahle J. [Eds.] *Aspects of Hellenistic Kingship*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilisation Vol. VII (Aarhus, 1996) 99-115.

Rajak T. *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Brill: Leiden, Boston, Köln; 2001).

Redfield J. 'Herodotus the Tourist'. In *CP* 80 (1985) 97-118.

Richnow W. *Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Stil des zweiten Makkabäerbuches* (Diss. Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen: unpublished; 1966).

Rigsby K.J. 'Seleucid Notes'. In *TAPA* 110 (1980) 233-254.

Ronen D. 'Ethnicity, Politics and Development: An Introduction'. In D.L. Thompson and D. Ronen [Eds.] *Ethnicity, Politics and Development* (Lynne Rienner: Boulder, 1986) 1-10.

Rossalini M. and Saïd S. 'Usages des Femmes et autres nomoi chez les 'sauvages' d'Herodote: essai de lecture structurale'. In *ASNP* 8 (1978) 949-1005.

Rost L. 'Die Bezeichnungen far Lund und Volk in A.T.'. In *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament* (Heidelberg, 1965).

Rost L. *Judaism Outside The Hebrew Cannon: An Introduction to the Documents*. Translated by D.E. Green (Abingdon: Nashville, 1976).

Rostovtzeff M. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. In Three Vols. (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1941).

Rudhardt J. 'The Greek Attitude to Foreign Religions'. In T. Harrison [Ed.] *Greeks and Barabarians* (Edinburgh, 2002) 172-185. Originally published as 'Les attitudes des Grecs a l'égard des religions étrangères' In *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*. 209 (1992) 219-38; translated by A. Nevill.

Sabourin L.S.J. *The Psalms: Their Origin and Meaning* (New York, 1974).

Safrai S. and Stern M. [Eds.] *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Philadelphia, 1974).

Schäfer P. *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World* (Routledge: London and New York; 2003).

Schalit A. 'A Clash of Ideologies: Palestine Under the Seleucids and Romans'. In A.J. Toynbee [Ed.] *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith* (Thames and Hudson: London, 1969) 48-76.

Schaper J. 'The Pharisees'. In W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, J. Sturdy [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of Judaism Vol. Three: The Early Roman Period* (Cambridge, 1999) III.402-427.

Schiffman L.H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, The Background of Christianity, The Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia, 1994).

Schubert K. 'A Divided Faith: Jewish Religious Parties and Sects'. In A.J. Toynbee [Ed.] *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith* (Thames and Hudson: London, 1969) 77-98.

Schürer E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Rev. Ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman. In Three Volumes (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1973-1987).

Schwartz S. 'Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine'. In *Past and Present*. 148 (1995) 3-47.

Seager A.R. and Kraabel A.T. 'The Impact of the Discovery of the Sardis Synagogue' In Hanfmann G. [Ed.] *Sardis From Prehistoric to Roman Times: Results from the Archaeological Exploration of Sardis 1958-1975* (Cambridge MA, Harvard; 1983) 168-190.

Seshadri-Croots K. 'At the Margins of Post-Colonial Studies Part I' and Afzal-Khan F. 'Part II'. In F. Afzal-Khan and K.Seshadrin-Croots *The Pre Occupation with PostColonial Studies* (Duke University Press: Durham, London; 2000) I.3-23; II 24-34.

Sherwin-White S. 'Seleucid Babylonia: A Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule'. In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White [Eds.] *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilisations From Syria to Central Asia After Alexander* (University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles; 1987) 1-31.

Sherwin-White S. and Kuhrt A. *From Samarkhand to Sardis* (Duckworth: London, 1993).

Shutt R.J.H. 'Letter of Aristeas: A New Translation and Introduction'. In J.H. Charlesworth [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume Two: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works* (DoubleDay: Garden City, New York; 1985) 7-34.

Sider G. 'When Parrots Learn to Talk and Why They Can't: Domination, Deception and Self Deception in Indian-White Relations'. In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29 No. 1 (1987) 3-23.

Sievers J. *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters: From Mattathais to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (Atlanta, 1990).

Silberstein L.J. and Cohn R.L. [Eds.] *The Other in Jewish Thought and History: Constructions of Jewish Culture and Identity* (New York University Press: New York, London; 1994).

Sivan H. 'What Has Jerusalem To Do With Rome (Or Athens, For That Matter?)'. Judaism, Classics, and Ancient History *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (1999.07.21).

Skehan P.W. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Introduction and Commentary by A.A. Di Lella Anchor Bible Series Vol. 39 (New York, 1987).

Slatkin L.M. 'Composition by Theme and the "Metis" of the Odyssey'. In S.L. Schein [Ed.] *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays* (Princeton, 1996) 223-237.

Smith M. 'Palestinian Judaism In The First Century'. In Davies M. [Ed.] *Israel: Its Role In Civilisation* (New York, 1956) 67-81

Smith M. *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh*. Vol. I 'Studies in Ancient Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism'. Vol. II 'New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic'. Ed. by S.J.D. Cohen (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1966).

Spek van der R.J. 'The Babylonian City'. In A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White [Eds.] *Hellenism in the East: The Interaction of Greek and Non-Greek Civilisations From Syria to Central Asia After Alexander* (University of California: Berkeley and Los Angeles; 1987) 57-74.

Stemberger G. 'The Sadducees – Their History and Doctrines'. In W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, J. Sturdy [Eds.] *The Cambridge History of Judaism Vol. Three: The Early Roman Period* (Cambridge, 1999) III.428-443.

Stern M. [Ed.] *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary by M. Stern. In Two Volumes (Jerusalem: 1976 [Vol. I], 1980 [Vol. II]).

Stern S. *Jewish Identity in Early Rabbinic Writings*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums. No. 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

Sterling G.E. *Historiography And Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Brill: Leiden, New York and Köln; 1992).

Stoler A.L. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London; 2001).

Tarn W.W. *Alexander The Great* (Cambridge, 1948).

Tarn W.W. and Griffith G.T. *Hellenistic Civilisation*. Third Ed. (London, 1952).

Tcherikover V. 'Prolegomena'. In Tcherikover V. and Fuks A. [Eds.] *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (Jerusalem, Cambridge (MA); 1957) I 1-112.

Tcherikover V. A. 'Was Jerusalem A "Polis"?'. In *IEF* 14 (1964) 61-78.

Tcherikover V. A. *Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1959).

Tcherikover V.A. and Fuks A. [Eds.] *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. I-III (Cambridge, 1957-64).

Thomas R. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992).

Thompson D.L. and Ronen D. [Eds.] *Ethnicity, Politics, and Development* (Lynne Rienner: Boulder, 1986).

Tonkin E., McDonald M., Chapman M. [Eds.] *History And Ethnicity* (Routledge: London and New York; 1989).

Torrey C.C. 'Yawan and Hellas as Designations of the Seleucid Empire'. In *JAOS* 25 (1904) 302-11.

Townsend M.E. *European Colonial Expansion Since 1871* (Chicago, Philadelphia, New York; 1941).

Toynbee A.J. 'The Mediterranean World's Age of Agony: The Historical Antecedents'. In A.J. Toynbee [Ed.] *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith* (Thames and Hudson: London, 1969) 19-46.

Troiani L. 'The Πολιτεία of Israel in the Graeco-Roman Age'. In Parente F. and Sievers J. [Eds.] *Josephus and the History of the Greaco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln; 1994) 11-22.

Usher S. [Ed.] *Greek Orators Vol. III: Isocrates Panegyricus and To Nicocles*. Translation and Commentary (Aris and Phillips Ltd: England, 1990).

Vermes G. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin Books: London, New York, Auckland; 1998).

Verrall A. W. *The Agamemnon Of Aeschylus*. With An Introduction, Commentary, And Translation (London, 1904).

Walbank F.W. 'The Problem of Greek Nationality'. In *Phoenix*. V (1951) 41-60.

Walbank F.W. 'History and Tragedy'. In *Historia* 9 (1960) 216-234.

Walbank F.W. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius: Volume Two. Commentary on Books VII-XVIII* (Oxford, 1967).

Walbank F.W. 'Nationality as a Factor in Roman History'. In *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* Vol. 76 (1972) 145-68.

Walbank F.W. *Polybius* (University of California: Berkeley, 1972a).

Walbank F.W. *The Hellenistic World* (London; 1981; Rev. Ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts; 1993).

Walbank F.W. 'Sources for the Period'. In F.W. Walbank et al. [Eds.] *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Hellenistic World* Vol. VII Part 1 Second Ed. (Cambridge, London, New York; 1984) 1-22.

Walbank F.W. 'The Hellenistic World: New Trends and Directions'. In *Scripta Classica Israelia* (1991-2) 90-113.

Walbank F.W. *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World: Essays And Reflections* (Cambridge, 2002).

Weber M. 'The Origin of Ethnic Groups'. In Hutchinson J. and Smith M. [Eds.] *Ethnicity* (Oxford, 1996) 35-40.

Weiser A. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Translated from the German *Die Psalmen* (Göttingen, 1959). The Old Testament Library (London, 1962).

Whybray R.N. 'Ben Sira and History'. In N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeulen (Eds.) *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom* (Leuven, 1999) 137-145.

Wilcken U. *Alexander the Great*. Translated by G.C. Richards (New York, London; 1967).

Willcock M.M. [Ed.] *Plautus: "Pseudolis"* (Bristol, 1987).

Williams C.S.C. *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Second Edition (London, 1964).

Williams M.H. [Ed.] *The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans: A Diaspoan Sourcebook* (John Hopkins: Baltimore, 1998).

Williamson H.G.M. *Word Biblical Commentary: Erza, Nehemiah* (Word Books: Texas, 1985).

Wills L.M. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, London; 1995).

Wintermute O.S. 'Jubilees: A New Translation And Introduction'. In J.H. Charlesworth [Ed.] *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Vol. Two (Doubleday: New York, 1985) 35-142

Zhou M. 'Between Us and Them in Chinese: Use of Lai (Come) and Qu (Go) in the Construction of Social Identities'. In Duszak A. [Ed.] *Us and Others: Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures* (John Benjamins: Amsterdam, Philadelphia; 2002) 51 – 67.

Ziolkowski J.E. 'National and Other Contrasts In The Athenian Funeral Orations'. In H.A. Khan [Ed.] *The Birth of European Identity; The Europe Asia Contrast in Greek Thought 490-322 B.C.* (University of Nottingham, 1994) 1-35.